

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Mutimer1971>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ARNOLD AND ORGANISED GAMES IN THE ENGLISH PUBLIC
SCHOOLS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

by



BRIAN T. P. MUTIMER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND
RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1971

Thesis
1971 F
62D

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Arnold and Organized Games in the English Public Schools of the Nineteenth Century" submitted by Brian T. P. Mutimer in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date... Sept. 2, 1971

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the life, work, beliefs and background of Dr. Thomas Arnold, Headmaster of Rugby School, 1828-42, in order to try and determine whether it is likely that he provided a starting point for the development of the organised games which became such a feature of the Public Schools in England in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The thesis consists of three parts.

Part I describes those aspects of England in Arnold's lifetime which most affected him, particularly the social and religious problems of the day, and gives an account of Arnold's life, with particular stress on his social, religious and educational beliefs.

Part II is concerned with Rugby School and with Arnold at that school. Initially a brief history of the school is given, in order to put Arnold's period into historical perspective; then a fuller description of the school during Dr. Wooll's tenure, which immediately preceded that of Arnold, is offered so that the condition of the school when he took over can be appreciated. Arnold's tenure is then discussed in the light of reforms he carried out and ideas he expressed. Special attention is paid to the tone of the school and its effect in changing the character of the boys' physical activities.

Part III is devoted to the Arnoldians, those men who had been pupils or assistant masters under Arnold and then gone on to become

assistant masters or headmasters in schools throughout the country, and in a few instances in other countries. Emphasis is placed on Charles J. Vaughan, the famous headmaster of Harrow School and on G. E. L. Cotton, the man who built Marlborough College into a nationally-known school. The work of the Arnoldians is examined in the hope of determining whether or not there is a correlation between their attitudes towards games and their attitude towards Arnold. The existence of such a correlation might help in understanding Arnold's work in the area of organised games.

The study shows that it was Arnold's work in transforming Rugby from a Barbarian to a Philistine school which set the scene for the subsequent development of organised games and the resultant athletic cult, rather than anything that Arnold did that was directly related to games. The overall conclusion is that the emphasis on organized games and the athletic cult that grew throughout the second half of the nineteenth century were the result of societal forces which were beyond the scope of any one man to create or to control.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate for a scholarship which made this study possible; to the headmasters who allowed him access to their schools' archives: Mr. J. S. Woodhouse, the Headmaster of Rugby School, Dr. R. L. James, the Headmaster of Harrow School, Mr. J. C. Dancy, the Master of Marlborough College, Mr. David Ashcroft, the Headmaster of Cheltenham College and Mr. D. J. Pullan, the Headmaster of King Edward VI School, Bury St. Edmunds; to the library staffs of these schools, particularly that of Harrow School, and Mr. N. C. Kittermaster, of Rugby School; Mr. Gerald W. Murray and Mr. E. G. H. Kempson of Marlborough College, as well as Mr. L. Warwick James for his kindness in permitting him to search through the collection of materials on Marlborough College and Mr. R. J. Woollatt of Cheltenham College.

A great debt is owed to the many people who have given their time in order to assist the writer's research; included among these, and deserving particular thanks are: Dr. T. W. Bamford, perhaps the greatest living authority on Dr. Thomas Arnold; Mr. David Newsome, whose book "Godliness and Good Learning" is an acknowledged classic; Mr. Peter McIntosh, the foremost authority on sports and games in the English Public Schools; Dr. I. Thomson, the author of "Almond of Loretto and the Development of Physical Education in the

Nineteenth Century"; Mr. B. J. Cahalin, for his kind permission to use his annotated bibliography of Arnold papers; Mr. Michael Craze, the author of A History of Felsted School, for many useful suggestions; Mr. B. W. T. Handford, the author of the history of Lancing College, for many kindnesses; Miss Mary L. Cross and Major Hubert Martineau; the Headmaster and the Second Master, Mr. P. H. Williams, of Christ's College, Christchurch, New Zealand; Mr. David Little, Head of the Physical Education Department of Stonyhurst College for a great deal of work on his behalf and the Headmaster for his assistance; the Headmaster and Mr. K. Osbourne of Bishop Vesey's Grammar School, Sutton Coldfield; Mr. J. L. Thorn the Headmaster and Mr. Peter J. Gwyn of Winchester College; the Master of Wellington College, the Hon. F. F. Fisher, and Mr. N. U. S. Strachan, his Administrative Assistant; Mr. L. M. Carey, the Headmaster and also his Registrar, of Bromsgrove School; Mr. D. A. Emms, the Headmaster of Sherborne School; the Principal, Mr. Buckmaster, Mr. Charles Smith and Mr. C. S. Allatt, Senior Lecturer of the Physical Education Department, all of Saltley College, Birmingham; the Headmaster of Berkhamsted Grammar School and Colonel A. L. Wilson of Berkhamsted; Mr. R. S. Bagshaw and his Senior Administrative Assistant, of the Exmouth Urban District Council; and Mr. A. R. D. Wright, the Headmaster and Mr. J. B. Lawson, the Librarian of Shrewsbury School.

Many of the headmasters of schools who were approached not only asked their librarians, archivists, or historians to conduct research on behalf of the writer but found the time to answer questions

themselves. Some of these gentlemen have been mentioned already, but of the others, the writer would like to express particular gratitude to: Mr. P. W. Martin, Headmaster of Warwick School; Mr. J. F. Gammell, Headmaster of Repton School; Miss M. E. Lorenz, Headmistress of Kingsbridge School; the Rev. Canon J. S. Habgood, Principal of The Queen's College, Edgbaston; Miss M. E. Pedley, Headmistress of Wyggeston Girls School, Leicester; the Rev. Canon Arthur J. Fielder, Master of Wyggeston's Hospital; Dr. G. A. Thompson, Headmaster of Wyggeston Boys School; Mr. W. S. Stewart, the Master of Haileybury College; the Rev. Bernard Rickett, the Headmaster of St. Edward's College, Malta; Mr. N. S. Pratt, Headmaster of King Edward VI School, Stratford-upon-Avon; Mr. D. S. Bland, Deputy Director of the Institute of Extension Studies Royal Institute, Liverpool; Mr. B. A. Nyhof, Kaniere School, New Zealand; Mr. J. Kerr, Acting Headmaster, The Hutchins School, Tasmania; Mr. David Conway, Headmaster of the Grammar School, Berwick-upon-Tweed; the Rev. R. G. Lunt, Chief Master of King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. A. F. Eggleston, the Headmaster, Felsted School, Dunmow; Mr. T. E. B. Howarth, High Master of St. Paul's School, Barnes; Mr. A. Chenevix-Trench, the Head Master of Eton College, Windsor; and Mr. Michael Hart, the Head Master of Mill Hill School, London.

The writer's gratitude is also extended to Professor J. R. de S. Honey, for permission to read his Oxford D. Phil. thesis and for assistance in supplying sources of information; to Mrs. Parkin-Moore, Dr. Arnold's great-granddaughter for her interest in the work and her

kindness in supplying personal details of Dr. Arnold's life.

A special debt is owed to the staffs of a number of libraries in which the writer worked. Librarians are a special breed and thousands of students are daily glad of that fact. The writer would like to thank the staff of Bodley's Library, Oxford; Corpus Christi College Library, Oxford; Oriel College Library, Oxford; Mr. David I. Masson of the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds; Mr. Pierse Tyrrel of the Cambridge University Library; the staff of the library at the University of Alberta, especially Mrs. B. Schwob and those members who work in the Reference and Inter-library Loan Section.

The members of the writer's committee are thanked most sincerely for the unstinting help, advice and constructive criticism they have provided throughout the preparation of this study. It would be invidious to single out any of the members for special mention and the writer would like to express his gratitude to all the following: Dr. P. J. Miller, the outside member, whose advice has been invaluable; Dr. Kevin Jones, the External Examiner; Dr. M. L. Howell, the Committee Chairman, whose scholarship and experience has helped to solve many difficulties; Dr. R. G. Glassford and Dr. P. L. Lindsay, whose good common sense has done much to keep the study within bounds; and Dr. H. J. McLachlin, whose help and cheerfulness have never failed.

The writer's family and friends all deserve much gratitude for making his trip to England so pleasurable.

Many thanks are extended to Mrs. Rhoda Warke, not only for her excellent typing, but also for her patience, understanding and speed.

Finally, the writer wishes to thank his wife, without whose constant help and sympathy this study would never have been written.



DR. THOMAS ARNOLD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION -----	1
PART I	
THE BACKGROUND	
II THE AGE OF ARNOLD -----	16
III ARNOLD'S LIFE AND BELIEFS -----	68
PART II	
ARNOLD AND RUGBY SCHOOL	
IV RUGBY SCHOOL PRIOR TO ARNOLD'S TENURE -----	132
V ARNOLD AND RUGBY SCHOOL -----	155
PART III	
THE ARNOLDIANS	
VI THE MAJOR ARNOLDIANS -----	209
VII THE MINOR ARNOLDIANS -----	265
VIII CONCLUSION -----	299
BIBLIOGRAPHY -----	328
APPENDICES -----	342

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Dr. Thomas Arnold ----- following page ----- ix
2. Rugby School Prior to Arnold's Tenure:
 - a) Entrance to the Hall, ca. 1809 ---- following page ----- 131
 - b) View from the Close, ca. 1809 ---- following page ----- 131
3. Rugby School as it was during Arnold's Tenure:
 - a) Street View ----- following page ----- 154
 - b) Entrance to the Hall ----- following page ----- 154
 - c) South West View from the Close --- following page ----- 154
 - d) School House. East View ----- following page ----- 154
4. The Curriculum during Arnold's Tenure
following page ----- 172
5. Letter from Dr. Arnold to A. P. Stanley
following page ----- 208
6. Letter from A. H. Clough, one of Arnold's Old
Boys, showing the customary method of writing
twice on one side of the paper ----- following page ----- 264

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Soon Thomas Arnold of Rugby was to do much to restore and refurbish the image of the public school. The house and prefect system, with their insistence on self-management, and the emphasis on games, to help lads build character, were features to be perpetuated in most later forms of English education.

Midwinter

At the beginning of the nineteenth century there were only seven schools which could be considered to be Public Schools by Sydney Smith's definition:

By a public school, we mean an endowed place of education, of old standing, to which the sons of gentlemen resort in considerable numbers, and where they continue to reside, from eight or nine, to eighteen years of age. . . . The characteristic features of these schools are, their antiquity, the numbers, and the ages of the young people who are educated at them.¹

When the Clarendon Commission was set up in 1861, its investigations were restricted to seven schools, Eton, Winchester, Westminster, the Charterhouse, Shrewsbury, Harrow and Rugby, with the addition of two day schools, St. Paul's and Merchant Taylors'.

The seven boarding schools, as early as 1820, were thought of as a group, separate from other schools, and all having some common characteristics:

They were endowed schools of some historical significance, with an education based on antiquity, in particular on Latin and, to a lesser extent, Greek language and literature. They were patronized essentially by the aristocracy and landed gentry, as well as by many who did not exactly fit into either category but who were rich enough to adopt the gentry's way of life and manners, and even to intermarry with them or mix with them occasionally at receptions and hunt-balls--without being fully acceptable to the uppermost stratum of society. The children of successful professional men in the Church, law and medicine were only found there occasionally, while the sons of middle-class parents, shopkeepers, farmers and the like were very rare indeed and the lower classes all but non-existent.²

St. Paul's and Merchant Taylors' lacked the qualifications of being boarding schools and of drawing their pupils exclusively from the upper classes.

There are now, in 1971, over two hundred schools which are acknowledged to be Public Schools, but the frame of reference has

changed considerably since Smith's definition. Currently the headmaster of a school must be a member of the Headmaster's Conference, or the Association of Governing Bodies of Public Schools (G. B. A.), before his school may be called a Public School. There are presently 247 schools so qualified, most of the headmasters of which belong to both bodies.³

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the Public Schools came under increasing, adverse criticism, starting with Sydney Smith's article of 1810 in the Edinburgh Review.⁴ It has been said that

in the first three decades of the century the public schools were in a parlous state. Their low moral tone, their narrow classical curriculum, their poor intellectual results, their roughness and bullying, their bad feeding and housing, were no longer likely to be tolerated merely because they were established institutions. The era of the Reform Act knew how to "mend or end" institutions which were not fulfilling their purpose. Evangelicalism was not tolerant of societies which appeared to encourage profanity and vice.⁵

There is no doubt that there was both profanity and vice in schools like Eton where seventy boys were locked, utterly without supervision from 8 p.m. until the next morning in the notorious Long Chamber. Edward Thring, the famous headmaster of Uppingham School was an Old Etonian and he recalls Long Chamber this way:

Cruel at times the suffering and wrong; wild the profligacy. For after eight o'clock at night no prying eye came near till the following morning; no one lived in the same building; cries of joy and pain were equally unheard; and, excepting a code of laws of their own, there was no help or redress for any one.⁶

Eton was probably no worse than other schools of the time, but its fame has brought it more attention than most.

In his inimitable way, Lytton Strachey describes the period

this way:

The public schools of those days were still virgin forests, untouched by the hand of reform. . . . It was a system of anarchy tempered by despotism. Hundreds of boys, herded together in miscellaneous boarding-houses, or in that grim "Long Chamber" at whose name in after years aged statesmen and warriors would turn pale, lived, badgered and over-awed by the furious incursions of an irascible little old man carrying a bundle of birch-twigs, (Dr. Keate) a life in which licensed barbarism was mingled with the daily and hourly study of the niceties of Ovidian verse. It was a life of freedom and terror, of prosody and rebellion, of interminable floggings and appalling practical jokes.⁷

As the oft-quoted remark of the Rev. Bowdler put it, "The Public Schools are the very seats and nurseries of vice."⁸

It was a critical time for the Public Schools, and when Thomas Arnold became headmaster of Rugby School in 1828 it was by no means certain that they would survive in anything like their present form.⁹ The schools did survive and much of the credit has been given to Arnold. Mack makes this clear when he says, "During the years which immediately followed the reform, tradition assigned the major portion of the credit to Thomas Arnold of Rugby."¹⁰ McIntosh includes Butler of Shrewsbury with Arnold as the great early reformers, but implies that Arnold had the greater effect: "...the reforms at Rugby under Arnold... permeated the whole mass of schools in the forties and fifties,"¹¹ The debt owed by "the whole mass of schools" is acknowledged in many of the histories of individual schools. Stanier, for example, in speaking of the reformation that took place at Magdalen School, notes that "...the time had come when a school such as has just been described was an anomaly and an anachronism. Arnold at Rugby had been revivifying Public School education for thirteen years. . . ."¹² Biographies of headmasters of the period immediately following

Arnold's time also note his influence. Coulton, for instance, in writing about Henry Hart of Sedbergh School, says that the Rugby tradition, which was started by Arnold was "...probably the greatest educational movement of nineteenth-century Europe."¹³

Arnold's reputation as the reformer of the Public Schools is great,¹⁴ but "as in the case of many other great reputations, a reaction has followed; and today it has become fashionable to speak of the 'Arnold myth'."¹⁵ Bamford is one of the most outspoken critics of Arnold's work in the Public Schools. He fully admits that Arnold is a great man¹⁶ but insists that his influence on the development of the Public Schools has been overemphasised:

We cannot in honesty remember him as a great school reformer, although that fact may be to some extent irrelevant, for great things were attempted in his name, whether justified or not.¹⁷

The fact remains that the Public Schools gradually ceased to be thought of as "nurseries of vice" and became institutions to which the middle classes were only too happy to send their sons.

Matthew Arnold, the son of Dr. Thomas Arnold, popularized the terms "Barbarian" meaning the aristocracy and landed gentry, and "Philistine" to refer to the middle classes. These names have become commonly accepted,¹⁸ and are used in that sense throughout this study. The Public Schools in the early years of the nineteenth century were basically Barbarian in nature. The boys who were educated there were sons of the aristocracy and the sports that they enjoyed were, to a large extent, those that they enjoyed at home: hunting, shooting and fishing. In many cases, while they were at school, this meant poaching. Football and cricket were played, there was

rowing at some schools, hare-and-hounds was popular and walking, bathing and such pastimes as bird-nesting were common. There was no undue emphasis placed on football or cricket or any other game, and organisation in the games was very limited. Of the two, cricket was the more popular, probably because of its aristocratic connections, unlike football which was not considered to be a gentlemanly game at all.¹⁹

At Rugby in the last decades of the eighteenth century the boys bathed in the river, or in the Headmaster's private bath; they ran forms of hare-and-hounds in which the praeposters were the huntsmen, or hounds, and the fags the hares. "The huntsmen, were arrayed in pink, and armed with long whips, which made pretty play about the hares' legs if they caught them."²⁰

Some of the bigger boys would perhaps steal into the Doctor's stable, and lame his horses by making them take impossible fences. Or, again, they might even break bounds, and go a-hunting in the season of the year, or try to find sport for their guns in the neighbouring covers.²¹

The over-riding passion at that time seems to have been fishing, and even as late as Arnold's time fishing in forbidden waters was not unknown.²² Arnold not only attempted to stop the boys fishing, but is also reputed to have stopped them from keeping hounds.²³

As the influence of the middle-classes, the Philistines, became greater, so the Barbarian pursuits lost favour and organised games became more popular and accepted. As the century progressed there grew up a feeling that games, particularly football and cricket, were ideal ways in which to inculcate worthwhile character traits. The increased emphasis on games and their use in training the country's

leaders became so great that it has been described as a cult, the athletic cult.

The 19th century witnessed a growth of Athleticism in Public Schools remarkable alike for its technical developments and for its social significance. . . . Socially, the cult of athleticism was closely bound up with the rise of a new middle class to educational privilege and political power.²⁴

As is suggested, the phenomenon was closely bound in with the social changes that were taking place in the country, most of which can be readily traced back to the rapid industrialization of the country and the equally swift rise to power of the middle classes.

Athleticism was not a totally new phenomenon. From time immemorial men have been revered for their physical prowess and even schoolmasters could win the boys' approval. George Innes, an assistant master at Rugby School towards the end of the eighteenth century "won the hearts of his pupils by a marvellous skill at single-stick."²⁵ Sydney Smith, in his article of 1810, singled out the undue weight that was placed on athletic exercises as a major point of attack:

There is a manliness in the athletic exercises of public schools, which is as seductive to the imagination as it is utterly unimportant in itself. Of what importance is it in after life, whether a boy can play well or ill at cricket; or row a boat with the skill and precision of a waterman? If our young lords and esquires were hereafter to wrestle in public, or the gentlemen of the Bar to exhibit Olympic games in Hilary Term, the glory attached to these exercises at public schools would be rational and important. But of what use is the body of an athlete, when we have good laws over our heads, -- or when a pistol, a postchaise, or a porter, can be hired for a few shillings? A gentlemen does nothing but ride or walk; and yet such a ridiculous stress is laid upon the manliness of the exercises customary at public schools--exercises in which the greatest block-heads commonly excel the most--as often render habits of idleness inveterate--and often lead to foolish expense and dissipation at a more advanced period of life.²⁶

By the end of the century the prominence that games had attained would

have shocked Smith profoundly.

It was not only in their eminence that games at the end of the century differed from those of Smith's day. They had become highly organised, compulsory and invested with a mysticism that was almost religious. Songs and poems were written glorifying games and athletes; schoolmasters were hired for their feats on the field rather than their performance in the examinations for degrees; and most people seemed to be convinced that the battle of Waterloo really had been won on the playing fields of Eton.²⁷ It was the period when Sir Henry Newbolt's poems, such as "Vitai Lampada," gave expression to the ideal in verses like this:

There's a breathless hush in the Close tonight
Ten to make and the match to win--
A bumping pitch and a blinding light,
An hour to play and the last man in.
And it's not for the sake of a ribboned coat,
Or the selfish hope of a season's fame
But his captain's hand on his shoulder smote--
Play up! Play up! and play the game.²⁸

Many writers have attributed the beginnings of the athletic cult to Thomas Arnold in much the same way as he has been credited with the reformation of the Public Schools. Mack notes this tendency when he states, "Critics of Arnold sometimes hold him responsible for the subordination of work to games in public schools."²⁹ McIntosh similarly notes that the "responsibility for effecting this change (from hostility to games by masters to active encouragement) has often been attributed to Dr. Arnold,"³⁰ In an article written in 1857, fifteen years after Arnold's death, one writer says: "The bold and manly games so peculiar to public schools of England . . . were earnestly and

wisely encouraged by Dr. Arnold."³¹ Rodgers, the author of an extensive study of the histories of the Public Schools, says, "To Dr. Arnold must also be attributed the athletic cult which has for so long characterised the popular conception of public-school education."³²

The idea that Arnold was the progenitor of the athletic cult, or at least deeply involved, is still strongly held, as is shown by the fact that Van Dalen and Bennett, in a recent publication, state that "Thomas Arnold and Edward Thring of Rugby and Uppingham were headmasters who made organized games compulsory as a means of training character."³³ Dr. R. L. James, the present Headmaster of Harrow, in a letter dated May 12, 1970 writes: "Really the cult, so to speak, may be said to have dated from the Head Mastership of Dr. Arnold of Rugby School. . . . It was Arnold who introduced organised games and his idea spread all over the public schools of England."³⁴

On the other hand, there have been writers, McIntosh for example, who have not accepted this version of the start of the athletic cult.³⁵ Indeed, as early as 1930 Mack was suggesting that it was Arnold's associates, such as Cotton, rather than Arnold, who saw the benefits that might accrue from an emphasis on games.³⁶ It has also been pointed out that Arnold liked to encourage games and sports, but that he did nothing to encourage the extravagant passion for athletics of later years in the Public Schools.³⁷

There are, then, two schools of thought, those who think that Arnold was the father of the athletic cult and those who believe he had nothing to do with it. The former have invariably stated their case with no evidence with which to support their argument; the latter have

stressed this lack of evidence for their unwillingness to accept Arnold as having taken a positive role in the birth of the cult. As one critic says, "There is . . . not a tittle of evidence to support (the claim) . . ." ³⁸

In almost every case in which Arnold's name has been linked with organised games his role viz a viz games has not been the main subject of the work. ³⁹ The question therefore arises as to whether those writers who say that there is little or no evidence to connect Arnold with organised games have simply failed to unearth evidence that was available because they were more concerned with the major emphasis of their work, or whether they were correct and the many writers who have made the connection have done so on insufficient evidence.

The purpose of this study is to try and determine which is the correct answer. The method employed consists of examining Arnold's beliefs and his character in a wide sense, rather than restricting the investigation to those aspects that refer directly to games, in the hope that it would be possible to determine not only what practical steps he took, if any, to promote games at Rugby, but also whether he was the kind of man who would have wished to further games.

In the belief that the revival of the Public Schools and the growth of the athletic cult were basically expressions of societal forces, and that a school is, in many ways, society in miniature, an attempt is made to examine Arnold and his work within the context of the times. Not only is the school seen as a microcosm of society but Arnold, it is contended, was very much a product of his age and, in him, many of the major societal forces can be seen in action.

In order to acquire the necessary information for such a study, the life and work, including the writings, both published and unpublished, of Arnold were examined, as were those of a number of Old Rugbeians who had been at the school with Arnold and then took up positions of authority within the field of education. It was believed that if a connection could be seen between these men and Arnold to the extent that it was obvious that they were disciples or followers of him, then it might be possible to see if they showed some commonalities in their work in the area of organised games. If any trends were to be seen, then it was hoped some light might be thrown on Arnold's own practices and beliefs.

Data for the study were collected from various sources. Books and magazines of the period and about the period were used extensively. In the search for unpublished materials, visits were made to a number of private individuals as well as to Rugby School, Harrow School, Marlborough and Cheltenham Colleges and Bury St. Edmunds School, the libraries and archives of Oxford University, Oriel and Corpus Christi Colleges, the British Museum and the archives of Bury St. Edmunds. Acknowledged experts in the field were consulted and many schools were asked for information on members of their staffs who had been at Rugby with Arnold. The results of this inquiry are presented in this study in an attempt to determine Arnold's attitudes towards and work in relation to organised games.

NOTES

¹Rev. Sydney Smith, "Remarks on the System of Education in Public Schools," Edinburgh Review, Vol. XVI, No: 32, August 1810, pp. 326-34.

²T. W. Bamford, Rise of the Public Schools (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1967), p. xi.

³See Whitakers Almanac (Beccles: William Clowes & Sons Ltd. 1971), pp. 537-541 for a complete list of H. M. C. schools and G. B. A. schools.

⁴Smith, loc. cit.

⁵E. C. Mack, Public Schools and British Opinion, 1780-1860 (London: Methuen, 1938), p. 52.

⁶G. R. Parkin, Life of Edward Thring, p. 23, as quoted in Mack, op. cit., p. 61.

⁷Lytton Strachey, Eminent Victorians (New York: The Modern Library, Random House, 1918), p. 205.

⁸Quoted ibid., p. 206. See also Thomas Arnold, Sermons: Christian Life at School, Vol. II, of the collected edition of 1878, first published in 1832. Reprinted, in part, in T. W. Bamford ed. Thomas Arnold on Education: A Selection from His Writings with Introductory Material by T. W. Bamford (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), pp. 48-51. To distinguish the works by Bamford, this text is referred to as "Bamford, 1970," the Rise of the Public Schools as "Bamford, Rise" and T. W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London: Cresset Press, 1960) as "Bamford, 1960."

⁹See Mack, op. cit., pp. 52-3. He makes the point that "if no reform had come from within, it is hard to believe that the public schools could have survived another fifty years."

¹⁰Ibid., p. 53.

¹¹P. C. McIntosh, Physical Education in England Since 1800 (London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd.), p. 19.

¹²R. S. Stanier, Magdalen School (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 149.

¹³G. G. Coulton, Henry Hart of Sedbergh (London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1923), pp. 14-15.

¹⁴Among the many authors who have given credit to Arnold for the reformation that took place in the Public Schools, and suggest that his reputation is well-founded are:

H. C. Barnard, A Short History of English Education from 1760-1944 (London: University of London Press Ltd., 1949), p. 85.

J. Rodgers, The Old Public Schools of England (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1938), pp. 1-3.

G. W. Murray, "A Century of Physical Education in English Boarding Schools," a paper given at the Inaugural Conference of the Boarding Schools' Physical Education Association, held at Marlborough College, 15-17th April, 1970.

M. C. Morgan, Cheltenham College (Chalfont St. Giles: Richard Sadler Ltd., 1968), p. 9.

West Buckland School (Ilfracombe: The Chronicle Press Ltd., 1958), pp. 9-10.

In this context it is noteworthy that R. Freeman Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1955), mentions only one Public School headmaster--Arnold. (See p. 413.)

See also Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education 1780-1870 (London: Lawrence & Wishart), p. 99.

¹⁵Mack op. cit., p. 53.

¹⁶Telephone interview, Thursday, May 20, 1971.

¹⁷Bamford 1960, op. cit., p. 212.

¹⁸McIntosh, op. cit., for instance, uses these terms in his work and has a chapter entitled: "Barbarians and Philistines at Play."

Other writers also use these names and at least one, T. C. Worsley, Barbarians and Philistines: Democracy and the Public Schools (London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1940) uses it in the title of his book.

¹⁹McIntosh, op. cit., p. 25.

²⁰W. H. D. Rouse, A History of Rugby School (London: Duckworth & Co., 1898), p. 159.

See Nimrod Charles Apperley "My Life and Times," Fraser's Magazine, No. II, 1842, pp. 321-334, passim for an account by one

who was a schoolboy at Rugby in this period.

²¹Rouse, loc. cit.

²²See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 71-3.

²³See Thomas Hughes, Tom Brown's School-days (London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1967), p. 118. First published 1857. There is evidence that if Arnold did put a stop to the keeping of hounds by the boys it was not a permanent change.

See "Sport at Rugby School" Baily's Magazine, September, 1879, pp. 204-8.

²⁴McIntosh, op. cit., pp. 15-6.

The expression, "the athletic cult" is common among authors writing of the nineteenth century. See, for example, Murray, op. cit., passim; Rodger, op. cit., p. 2; A. Bryant English Saga 1840-1940 (London: Collins, 1967), pp. 157-8; and Lytton Strachey, op. cit., p. 234, who speaks of "...the worship of athletics...".

²⁵Rouse, op. cit., p. 152.

²⁶Smith, op. cit., pp. 328-9.

²⁷The growth of the cult has been well described by McIntosh and there is a multitude of writers who testify to its existence. Apart from McIntosh, op. cit., Chapters 2-5, see:

Worsley, op. cit., passim; Murray, op. cit., passim; D. R. W. Silk, "The Rolse of Games in the Boarding School Society," a paper presented to the Inaugural Conference of the Boarding Schools' Physical Education Association, held at Marlborough College, 15-17th, April, 1970, passim; Strachey, op. cit., p. 234; Mack, op. cit., p. 73; Edward Lyttelton, "Athletics in Public Schools," Nineteenth Century, January 1880; D. Newsome, Godliness and Good Learning (London: John Murray, 1961), pp. 26-7, 200-6, 216-227 in particular; and J. J. Findlay, Arnold of Rugby: His School Life and Contributions to Education (Cambridge: University Press, 1914), p. 103. These works are only a minute selection from the many which offer the same kind of authority. It is also instructive to look at some of the novels which have been written on the theme, starting with Tom Brown's School-days, by Thomas Hughes and including such as The Loom of Youth by E. Waugh, Vachell's The Hill, Arnold Lunn's The Harrovians, Stalky & Co., by Rudyard Kipling, and many others.

Note also the numerous school songs, especially those of Harrow, glorifying games, such as "Forty Years On."

²⁸Sir Henry Newbolt, "Vitai Lampada" as quoted in McIntosh

op. cit., p. 70.

²⁹Mack, op. cit., p. 73.

³⁰McIntosh, op. cit., p. 28.

³¹"Tom Brown of Rugby," Littell's Living Age, no: 706, December 5, 1857, p. 579.

³²Rodgers, op. cit., p. 2.

³³D. B. Van Dalen and B. L. Bennett, A World History of Physical Education, Cultural, Philosophical, Comparative (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 293.

³⁴Dr. R. L. James, private communication.

³⁵McIntosh, op. cit., p. 28.

The same opinion is expressed in this author's other works, e. g., Landmarks in the History of Physical Education (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 183 (N. B. This book was written with co-authors: J. G. Dixon, A. D. Munrow and R. F. Willetts); Sport in Society (London: C. A. Watts & Co., Ltd., 1968), pp. 65-6.

³⁶Mack, op. cit., p. 73.

³⁷Sir Joshua Fitch, Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 103.

³⁸A. B. Badger, The Public Schools and the Nation (London: Robert Hale, Ltd., 1944), p. 30.

³⁹One exception is the short article by W. H. G. Armitage, "Thomas Arnold's Views on Physical Education," Physical Education, Vol. 47, 1955, pp. 27, 28 and 44.

PART I

THE BACKGROUND

CHAPTER II

THE AGE OF ARNOLD

Lords and Commons of England, consider what a nation it is whereof ye are and whereof ye are the governors; a nation not slow and dull, but of a quick, ingenious, and piercing spirit; acute to invent, subtile and sinewy to discourse, not beneath the reach of any point the highest that human capacity can soar to.

Milton.

The first decades of the nineteenth century¹ have been described as an age of reform² and it is true that almost every aspect of life came under scrutiny. Attempts were made by good men to erase the evils that they saw; to ease the burden of life for the poor; and to make England the greatest of nations in all respects. Dr. Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby School 1828-1842, was a man filled with the reforming zeal that characterised the era in which he lived and worked. "My love for any place or person, or institution, is exactly the measure of my desire to reform them; . . ." he said in a letter to A. P. Stanley, in 1835.³

Probably the most far-reaching reform, and certainly one in which Arnold was keenly interested, was that of Parliament; but there were many other changes for the better in all spheres of life. The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 tried to repair the damage caused by the Speenhamland Act;⁴ the first effective Factory Act was passed in 1833, the same year that slavery was abolished in the British Empire; and Sir Robert Peel not only established the London Police Force, but also secured the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Bill in 1829. Arnold was so concerned about the Catholic problem that, in 1828, he wrote one of his most important works on the subject entitled, "The Christian Duty of Granting the Claims of the Roman Catholics."

Greater emphasis was placed on health and sanitation during the period, and again Arnold was closely concerned, for not only did a number of boys at Rugby die because of the lack of sanitation in the school and the town, but the school, in 1841, had to be evacuated until the fever had abated. Reform reached the prisons, the movement

being led by people like Elizabeth Fry, the Quaker woman who not only formed an association for the improvement of the lot of female prisoners on Newgate, but also instituted an order of nursing sisters and persuaded the government to improve the conditions of prisoners who were transported. Throughout the first half of the century the severity of penalties for offences was decreased. Deportation for life took the place of hanging for picking pockets; the theft of five shillings from a shop ceased to be a capital offence, as did a number of other crimes that would, today, be called misdemeanours at worst, such as defacing Westminster Bridge, or impersonating a Chelsea Pensioner. After 1838, four years before Arnold's death, no person was hanged except for murder or attempted murder. This lessening of harshness in the forms of punishment had a parallel at Rugby, where Arnold instituted a sliding scale of punishments with flogging and expulsion as the final resort.

Gradually the common-law courts and the court of chancery were reformed. The professions increased the standards of competence of their members and introduced methods of ensuring that the standards were upheld. At Rugby, Arnold was responsible for increasing the status both of headmasters and assistant masters. The municipal corporations of England and Wales were reformed by an Act of 1835. In 1828 the University of London, a secular institution, was founded. Arnold was, for some time, a member of the Senate of the new university, but resigned when he was unable to enforce his views upon the rest of the members.

In all these ways--the organization of the new police, the new

Poor Law, and the new municipal councils--the pattern of government in England was changed fundamentally within a single decade. In conjunction with the removal of religious disabilities, these reforms laid the structural foundations for the new kind of State in Britain: a State in which the electoral rights and civil rights of citizens were extended and given greater legal protection, but in which the ordinary citizen was subjected to a much greater degree of interference, direction, and control from the centre. The most spectacular element in this whole process--the Reform Bill of 1832--ensured that the new State should also be partially democratized at the centre. The full significance of 1832 in the history of the country is appreciated only if it is seen as the central change in this many-sided transformation of an agricultural nation ruled by squires, parsons, and wealthy landowners into an industrial nation dominated by the classes produced by industrial expansion and commercial enterprise.⁵

Many of the changes listed here were of prime importance to Arnold and to the Public Schools. "The classes produced by industrial expansion and commercial enterprise" formed a prospective clientele for the Public Schools, if they could be reformed so that the nouveaux riches could place their sons there with some confidence. Perhaps most important, from Arnold's point of view, was the change in attitude that was engendered by the fact that the "ordinary citizen was subjected to a much greater degree of interference, direction, and control from the centre," for this was one of the basic changes that Arnold made at Rugby. He became the patriarch of a paternalistic system, and the changes that were being made in the world outside the school walls helped him accomplish this, by creating an ethos in which such changes were not alien.

Arnold's political sympathies were given to the Radicals; he made a long, tiring and expensive journey from the Lake District to Rugby in 1835 in order to vote for the Radical candidate. However, of the two major parties, the Tories and the Liberals, his ideas were

much closer to those of the latter. The Tories were in power from 1783 to 1830, and the Liberals, or Whigs, were not even an effective opposition, being a small minority in the House and not even leading a popular movement within the country. The Tory leaders were able men who had the support of the church, the universities, the services, most of the country gentry, as well as the great landed families and also the unreformed municipal corporations in the towns.

All of these blocs of power were concerned with maintaining the status quo, being afraid that any change would affect them adversely. Nevertheless there were men among these privileged groups who were prepared to assist reforms if they could be convinced that these reforms would not threaten their own positions. Within the political party itself there was, inevitably, a clash between the ultra-conservatives and those who advocated change.

Pressure for parliamentary reform grew steadily, despite the punishments meted out to some of its advocates. In 1794, Pitt, having refused to mitigate a 1793 sentence that had been passed on Muir and Palmer, two parliamentary reformers, thus allowing them to be transported, went a step further by charging Thomas Hardy, Thewall, and Horne Tooke with high treason for advocating parliamentary reform. The harshness of the treatment these men received was due, in large part, to the events across the English Channel at this time. The French Revolution began in earnest in 1789 and fears of mob-rule and Jacobinism, which Arnold shared, were very strong in England for several decades. Luckily for England, Hardy and his fellow prisoners

were given a trial by jury and acquitted. London, although strongly anti-Jacobin, demonstrated, very clearly, approval of the result of the trial.

As the growth of opinion in favour of electoral reform grew, so did the repressive measures of the government. Political discussion was silenced. The Corresponding and other Societies were suppressed by Act of Parliament. Habeas Corpus was suspended⁶ and a number of men were kept in prison for years, despite there being no evidence against them. Public meetings, other than those licensed by magistrates, were prohibited, and, as none was licensed, there were no legal meetings at all. The Whigs, in disgust, "retired to their country houses in an aimless 'secession' from their duties in Parliament, where alone criticism of government was permitted."⁷ Trade Unionism, which Arnold vigorously condemned, was made illegal and the workers were placed at the mercy of their employers. The Combination Laws against Trade Unions were repealed in 1823. Despite their lack of power and the divisions within the party, it was largely as a result of the efforts of a group of Whigs, led by Charles Fox, that the Reform Bill was passed in 1832. Arnold campaigned with his customary vigour on behalf of the Bill, although he recognised that it was no panacea for the ills of the poor, and warned them that the results of the Bill would be less beneficial than many of them believed.⁸ The radical reformers were vociferous in their support of the Bill, but were ineffective in Parliament and had to remain so until there was an electoral reform to give them the necessary numbers to make them effective.

The passing of a Catholic emancipation bill, in April 1829, hastened the reform of parliament, because some of the Tories thought that a more representative House would not have passed such a bill and also that the rising costs of elections were favouring the financiers at the expense of the landed aristocracy. Unfortunately for the Tories, Wellington, who was at that time Prime Minister, made no move towards reform. Had he done so the Whigs might have been kept from power for some years more, and Arnold might not have become Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford. As it was, in 1830 Lord Grey formed the first Whig government in many years, making the acceptance of a reform bill a condition of his taking office, yet his cabinet was the most aristocratic of the century.⁹ Despite Grey's desire for reform, the Whig government was as repressive as the Tory had been. As a result of popular disturbances, the Whigs hanged nine men or boys, and had 450 others sentenced to transportation, of whom close to 200 were sent for life.

In 1831 Grey introduced a Bill which astounded everyone by its all-encompassing nature. It went far beyond what anyone had expected, even if not as far as the radicals had hoped; virtually all the rotten and pocket boroughs were abolished at one stroke.¹⁰ The Tories were shocked by the extent of the Bill and attacked it on all fronts. Eventually they forced the dissolution of Parliament, but the Bill was reintroduced. This time the Lords rejected it. In December of 1831 it was introduced for the third time and, in 1832, it was finally passed.

Such a simplistic recounting of the bare facts does nothing to convey the furore that was created. Arnold was keenly interested in

the process of the Bill, as is shown by the articles he wrote in The Englishman's Register, the newspaper he published.¹¹ It has been said that "after fifteen months of political agitation unparalleled in the history of Great Britain, the Reform Bill was carried in the teeth of the resistance of the Peers."¹² The agitation included a general election, a promise by the King to create enough Peers to pass the Bill, the resignation of Lord Grey and his subsequent triumphant return. There were riots in towns as far apart as Nottingham, Derby and Bristol. In Bristol the cavalry, three troops of horse, was brought in to quell the disorder. Large mobs gathered in London and elsewhere and the talk was verging on threats of revolution. In Rugby the passing of the Reform Bill was celebrated by a public dinner with Arnold as the Chairman in charge of the affair, which annoyed the local Tories a great deal.

The Reform Act was followed, in 1835, by the Municipal Corporations Act, which was even more democratic than the Reform Act because it gave all ratepayers the right to vote for the new Municipalities. The Act only applied to the larger towns; in the rural districts the Justices of the Peace maintained the administrative control until 1888, when elected County Councils were established. Gradually the middle classes were achieving political as well as financial power and the education of the younger generation was becoming more of a problem. The question was whether the Public Schools could provide a suitable environment and education for these boys. It was a question with particular relevance to Rugby, which was traditionally a middle-class school.

The 1832 Act, far-reaching as it undoubtedly was, by no means stopped the clamour for parliamentary reform. One of the major, and most radical, reform movements made its greatest impact in the thirties and forties, during the period when Arnold was achieving a reputation as a headmaster, a Churchman and a social reformer. This movement, known as Chartism because of the "People's Charter" that William Lovett and Francis Place drew up in 1838, called for universal male suffrage; equal electoral districts; removal of the property qualifications for members of Parliament; payment of members of Parliament; a secret ballot and annual general elections. Strangely, considering his stand on the Reform Bill, Arnold condemned the Chartists, but his reasons were, for him, sound.¹³ He saw the Chartists as prospective destroyers of society and as he thought that all citizens should support the society in which they lived, at the same time changing and reforming it but doing so within the framework of that society, he could not have much sympathy with the followers of Lovett and Place. Like many men of the times he feared insurrection and believed that the Chartists were instigating it.

The monarchy, with the French Revolution as a grim warning, had every reason to fear insurrection, but George III, 1760-1820, suffered from increasing bouts of lunacy and it is doubtful whether he understood the situation. His son, who became George IV on his father's death, was Prince Regent for many years, and it was he, with the Duke of York, who entertained the Heads of State and the war leaders at Oxford in 1814. Arnold was an enthusiastic spectator of the festivities and ceremonies that accompanied the visit. In 1830 William IV,

the popular "sailor king," succeeded to the throne, and it was his wife, Queen Adelaide, who, as Dowager Queen, paid an official visit to Rugby in 1839.

On June 20, 1837, William was succeeded by a young girl of eighteen. Queen Victoria was a self-possessed, tenacious girl who honestly wished to do her best for the country.¹⁴ Although small, under five feet tall, the young queen carried herself with grace and dignity. She was neither beautiful nor handsome, but her voice was clear and musical and she was physically strong; she gave birth to nine children; was a good horsewoman, dancer and games-player, being fond of both indoor and outdoor sports as well as fresh air. The example she gave of participating in healthful and vigorous pursuits must have influenced many of her subjects. In her later years, however, she developed a mild form of hypochondria, despite the fact that she never had a serious illness in her life.

Victoria's predecessors had been strongly Tory in outlook, but for the first years of her reign the queen was quite definitely pro-Whig and equally definitely anti-Tory. This political leaning probably stood Arnold in good stead, for Victoria was impressed by him and had a copy of his Sermons, in which she pencilled comments. In 1840 Arnold was presented to the Queen, thereby fulfilling one of his greatest ambitions, not for himself, but for the honour it brought to the school.

Following her marriage, in 1840, to her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Victoria's ideas changed considerably and became much more Tory. More important, however, was the fact

that Victoria and Albert were able to supply a change in tone in the Court which was both needed and desired. The respectability with which they endowed the Court was well-suited to the views of her subjects. The Queen's standards of moral behaviour, both for the members of her Court and for her subjects in general, were formal and severe, even to the point of objecting to widows remarrying. There is no doubt that Victoria assisted in the development of an ethos in which reform was an integral part of life and in which the Public Schools could not continue in their unregenerate state.

One of Arnold's best friends was William Wordsworth who, with Samuel Taylor Coleridge, was responsible for affecting much of Arnold's thinking. This was an era of contrasts, and in no aspect of life is this more obvious than in the intellectual field. On the one hand the Romantics were flourishing and on the other the scientists and the Utilitarians were gaining strength. It was the age of Byron, Blake, Jane Austen, Hazlitt, Landor, Scott, Keats, Shelley, Southey, and Lamb, as well as Coleridge and Wordsworth. Charles Dickens was born in 1812; Byron was at his height circa 1815, and Scott published the first of the Waverley novels in 1814. Constable, using a different medium, was preparing the way for the later impressionists with his landscapes. It was, indeed, a brilliant period in the arts.

Counterbalancing the Romantics were the works of Thomas Malthus, which were widely received, and which, with David Ricardo's Iron Law of Wages, helped to form the theories and practice of the doctrine of laissez-faire.¹⁵ Also in the opposite camp from the

most of the population. There was a small Roman Catholic minority which, though it was denied full civil rights, lived quietly and had little political importance. There was a large minority of Protestant Dissenters who also were without full civil rights, although this did not weigh as heavily upon them as it did upon the Roman Catholics. The nonconformists were, in the main, shopkeepers and members of the lower middle classes from the urban areas. The poor in the towns have been termed "pagan."¹⁸

The Church of England was very catholic, containing men of widely differing theological opinions, many of whom were grouped into parties. This diversity, which might have proved divisive, was, in fact, its strength. All the factions remained within the Anglican communion and preserved it as a living organism. There was even an evangelical movement within the Church whose members' beliefs were, in some ways, similar to those of the Methodists who had seceded from the Church. These evangelicals, around the turn of the century, formed the most active group within the Church and they were the leaders, demonstrating, in their own lives, a piety which was at odds with the low moral standards of the age. They brought the Church a revived belief in a personal religion. Without this revival it is doubtful if the Oxford Movement would ever have taken place.

The urge for reform that was so strong in this period was felt by the Church as much as by Parliament. Among the abuses which men, both in and out of the Church, realised had to be changed were pluralism, non-residence and nepotism.¹⁹ Some of the highest Church authorities were involved in what could only be described as

Romantics was Jeremy Bentham, the originator of Utilitarianism and the forerunner of John Stuart Mill. Bentham's creed accepted the principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Although his tenets were considerably altered by his major disciple, John Stuart Mill, Bentham was one of the few reformers to be recognised and appreciated in his own lifetime, even if it were only towards the end of his long life. His work has had long-reaching effects:

Bentham founded a school of thought which, developing and changing in the hands of his disciples as the century progressed, provided a dynamic force of legal, social, political and economic reform, and a touchstone for all governmental policies. The movement began by adopting completely the laissez-faire, individualistic doctrines of Adam Smith (1723-90) in economics, and a far-reaching programme of legal simplification and codification which in time transformed the whole system of English common law and judicial procedure.¹⁶

Arnold had a great deal in common with Bentham, especially his habit of accepting nothing without examining it and his rational basis for change. However, Arnold could never accept Bentham's atheism, and so what might have proved an interesting alliance was never made. Arnold thought the Utilitarians had robbed goodness of its nobility in their stress on usefulness.¹⁷

Arnold's rejection of anything that was not truly Christian is typical of the man. He was, first and foremost, a Christian and the state of the Established Church was one that caused him great anguish and which he did everything within his power to change. The Established Church of England was richly endowed and greatly privileged in the early days of the nineteenth century. It was supported, even if not wholeheartedly, by the upper classes and, in the rural areas by

misappropriation of funds, to the extent that some were enabled to become millionaires.²⁰ The changes required to alter this state of affairs were mainly administrative, although there was also a movement, running concurrently with that for administrative reform, "for a revival of the conception of the church as a divinely appointed society," ²¹

The practical results of the move towards reform in the Church were a series of commissions and Acts of Parliament between 1834 and 1840 which saw the setting up of a permanent board of ecclesiastical commissioners; the banning of clergymen from holding more than two livings; the subdivision of large parishes; the settlement of the troublesome question of tithes for England and Wales;²² the reduction of the income for some of the richer sees; the limitation of cathedral chapters;²³ the creation of new sees and the rearrangement of others. The result of all these changes was to satisfy most laymen that the worst of the abuses had been rectified. Nevertheless, it was thought to be insufficient simply to reform the ecclesiastical, financial and administrative side of the Church; "the church must assert her position as a divine society, proclaim her infallible authority, and revive the traditions of a time when this authority was unquestioned." ²⁴

It was against this background that the Oxford Movement was born and grew, and the Latitudinarians, or Broad Church men, of whom Arnold was one of the best-known and the most virulent, offered their counter opinions on doctrinal questions.²⁵ During the thirties

there appeared a growing split between those sections of the Anglican Church that were influenced by the evangelicals and those under the sway of the new High Church Tractarian Movement.²⁶ From 1833 onwards, John Henry Newman, John Keble, who had been a close friend of Arnold, and Richard Froude, all Fellows of Oriel College, Oxford, Arnold's old College, created the Oxford Movement. The sermons and writings of these men, especially the Tracts of the Times which they published in the thirties, were designed to revive the doctrine of apostolic succession as the basis of the Church's authority. The Movement began largely as an attack on the Liberal tendencies within the Church, and had the effect of driving the evangelicals into a closer connection with nonconformity. Opponents of the Oxford Movement denounced it as Romanism in disguise. Arnold, who had attacked the movement from the beginning, and was the only man of any real stature to do so, said that he felt Roman Catholics to be a fair enemy, but Newmanites were Frenchmen disguised in a red coat "and holding a post within our praesidia, for the purpose of betraying it."²⁷

Very early in the movement's history Arnold had seen what few others had, that the path the Tractarians were treading must lead to the Roman Catholic Church, and in 1845 Newman did, in fact, join the Roman Church and many of his friends followed him. Some, like Pusey and Keble, remained in the Anglican Church and continued to assert the importance of clerical office, vestment, and ritual. Eventually the Broad Church party was triumphant, but it was a long and bitter struggle. It is difficult for people living in the second half of the

twentieth century to realise just how great was the furore created by this theological dispute. Not only clerics, but laymen had an opinion and expressed it forcibly to their fellows, in letters and in print. Even schoolboys argued over the principles involved, especially the boys at Rugby with Arnold. The dispute served one function in that it roused intense public interest in ecclesiastical and religious matters.²⁸ It also served to bring Thomas Arnold to the forefront as a Churchman of decided opinions who was prepared to express them, however unpopular they might be, and when he first attacked the Oxford Movement he was very much a lone figure. The resultant publicity probably did Rugby more good than harm, however.

Another factor in English life at the time, which was beneficial to Rugby and to all the Public Schools, was the introduction and rapid growth of the railways. With this easier form of transportation, parents were more inclined to send their children across the country than when the coaches made travelling hazardous and slow. The railways were both a symptom of the new age and helped to create it. When George III came to the throne in 1760 there were no canals; few hard roads, virtually no cotton industry; no factory system; few capitalistic manufacturers; a little smelting of iron by coal. While there had been a great deal of land enclosure, there had been no general movement to collect the small farms together to form big ones. From 1760 on, these things came about with ever-increasing speed, till by the last decade of the eighteenth century the pace could be described as "terrible."²⁹

One example of the rapidity with which changes were made is

seen in the way in which different forms of transportation, culminating in the railways, followed swiftly one upon the other. The rapidity of these changes is startling when compared with the thousands of years that it had taken for the horse and human foot to be superseded. In 1760 the riding-horse and the pack-horse were paramount. During George III's reign they gave way to the coach, the wagon and the barge. Hardly had men become accustomed to the relative speed and comfort of the coach when Stephenson's Rocket heralded a new era.

The transformation that was wrought in transportation was paralleled in many other aspects of life. A few examples will suffice to demonstrate the quickening pace of life and the many inventions which followed each other in rapid succession.³⁰ In 1825, the year that Stephenson ran his "Locomotion" at the unprecedented speed of 15 m. p. h., Faraday found that benzine was a constituent of petroleum, a discovery that was to affect the construction of the automobile toward the close of the century; John Crowther took out a patent for an hydraulic crane; the steam jet was first applied to construction work by Timothy Hackworth; a planing machine for iron was built by Joseph Clement; Thomas Telford erected one of the earliest chain suspension bridges at the Menai Strait; the first shaft of Brunel's Thames tunnel was sunk and mechanics' institutes were opened at Exeter and Belfast. At about the same time Herschel was working out his spectrum analysis; Fox Talbot was observing the orange line of strontium; and John Walker was perfecting his invention of friction matches.

In Lancashire, in 1826, nearly a thousand power looms were destroyed by the distressed operatives. The power loom was patented

in 1785 by Edmund Cartwright, and the Jacquard loom, invented by J. M. Jacquard, which enabled any design to be woven, had been perfected in 1804. Thus, only forty years after the first patent, the looms were being used in such quantities that a thousand could be destroyed because operatives felt threatened. Arnold's concern for these people is expressed in a number of letters he wrote to the Hertford Reformer in the late thirties.

It is difficult to the point of impossible to single out any one of the many developments and inventions of the period as being paramount, yet the growth of the railways was, perhaps, the most symptomatic of them all. Almost every aspect of English life was affected by the railways, which were both a result of the progress made in the iron industry with the increased consumption of coal occasioned by the use of steam-power, and the cause of a vast expansion in the metal trades and a greatly increased demand for coal. The lower costs of transport increased home consumption of goods and also enabled British manufacturers to compete successfully abroad. Further, the railway was itself an exportable item. British-built railways appeared on every continent. Agriculture too benefited from the improved opportunities of marketing perishable goods, bringing animals to market, and taking fertiliser to the fields. Most important, from a social point of view, the railways made travel easy. An irreversible change was made in the life of the people, and it was a change that met with Arnold's complete approval.

The railways contributed to the ever-expanding urban centres. In 1815 Britain's "... industrial heart was beginning to throb, first in

the great cotton-mills of Lancashire and soon in her coal-mines and blast-furnaces."³¹ As early as this, Britain was already importing 82 million pounds of cotton.³² The older wool industry was also undergoing a great, if slower transformation. Although weaving factories were not yet established on a large scale, power spinning was taking the place of hand spinning. The recent wars had brought a boom period to the heavy industries of iron, coal and engineering which was aided by the network of canals which was just about complete and the main roads which were being remade by Telford and John McAdam.

The combination of easy transportation, the creation of industrial centres, the Enclosure Acts³³ and the revolution in agriculture led to a redistribution of the population. Coupled with this was a distinct increase in numbers of people. In 1815 England was a country of some 13 million; the population was growing fast and would double by 1871. The reasons for the increase were that more babies were surviving, men were living longer and the Irish were pouring into the country.³⁴ Even in the slums of the new industrial towns the expectation of life was greater than ever before. People, despite the hardships and poverty, were, on the whole, better fed, better clothed, less likely to contract disease and better cared for when they did, than they had been the previous century. Large urban populations were forming in the north-west of England, in South Wales and between the Firth of Forth and the Firth of Clyde. London was already a city of more than one million inhabitants, while Birmingham, Sheffield, Liverpool, Leeds, Manchester and Glasgow were all rapidly increasing

in size. This swift growth of urban populations, with the rise in the employment of women and children in the coal-mines and cotton mills, all led to new social problems on a scale hitherto unknown.³⁵ Arnold appreciated these problems and tried to help cure them. He wrote articles and even published his own newspaper for a time in an attempt to help the people who were caught up in the rapid changes that were transforming their lives.

Many of the social problems were exacerbated by the war and then by the post-war resettlement. From 1793, when England entered the war against France, to 1815, when Wellington defeated Napoleon at Waterloo, the country was at war. For the Public Schools the war meant that widows, or wives of men in the army and navy, often moved to the vicinity of the schools in order that their children might benefit from the free, or cheap, education which was a part of their charter. The demand was so great that in 1853 Wellington College was founded to provide a gratuitous, or nearly gratuitous, education for orphans of indigent and meritorious officers of the army.³⁶ From a personal point of view Arnold found the war extremely interesting and he followed its progress intently. As a small boy he was able to see much of the preparations that were carried out in his home town of Cowes on the Isle of Wight, and his love of history and geography was fostered by the ships and flags that came from many nations to Cowes harbour.

Nelson's victory at Trafalgar gave Great Britain³⁷ domination of the seas; Waterloo saved Europe from the domination of France. The desire to maintain supremacy on the sea and to maintain a

European balance of power remained the cornerstones of British foreign policy for the rest of the nineteenth century. Great Britain's part in the war had left her in a position of high esteem as far as Europe was concerned. It was conceded that she had the naval power to control the sea and that no one, and possibly no combination of nations, could hope to oust her. Luckily for all concerned, Britain's aims were peaceful.

The British statesmen wanted European markets for the goods which were being produced in ever-increasing quantities and at reasonable costs. This superiority in industrial and commercial technique coupled with her national unity and naval power combined to make Great Britain a powerful arbiter in the affairs of the world, especially the European world. London soon became the economic capital of the world.

This was the greatest opportunity in Britain's history. Her enormous economic advantages, skilfully and opportunely used, could bring her a prosperity and a kind of world-leadership hitherto unknown.³⁸

However, as Arnold and other thinking men realised, the social unrest in the country could easily ruin any chances of prosperity.

The spirit of commerce in the land was strong and became stronger, especially after Waterloo, but concomitant with this was a feudal belief in the value of land. Thus it was that although money ranked high in the scale of values, status came, not so much from the possession of capital, as from owning land. Much of the internal conflict in England in the first half of the nineteenth century was the result of the struggle between landlords and manufacturers, between

the spirit of feudalism and that of commerce.³⁹ The religious revival had a civilising effect, and this was true both of Wesleyan Methodism and of Anglicanism. The Wesleyans and the Anglican, Clapham Sect,⁴⁰ came from widely differing social backgrounds, but possessed very common aims, such as their concern for the poor, the homeless and the neglected. The aristocracy and the landed gentry had always accepted a responsibility for the poor; the views of the new manufacturers were rather different. One of Arnold's major concerns was to inculcate a desire in his boys to help the poor, and he set them a good personal example. He also viewed with pleasure the demise of feudalism.

The situation was a changing one, and this, to some extent, explains the differences of outlook towards the poor. In George III's reign the village was the characteristic unit and the paternalistic squire and parson were all-important. By the year of Waterloo the scene was changing. More and more people were moving to the towns and cities. The Enclosure Acts were forcing people away from the villages, in part because the Acts caused an increase in the size of estates and the end of numerous small farms and holdings. The lot of the yeoman was worsened by the fact that the new industrial machinery was concentrating work in the factories and taking it out of the cottages, so that many a small farmer found himself not only losing his own source of income, but also that of his wife and children, thus leaving him no alternative but to sell and move.⁴¹ The poor became mobile, and where, in the past, the village had felt a responsibility for its own

poor, it acknowledged no claim from the transient poor.

An attempt was made to alleviate the distress of the unemployed and those who were receiving poverty-level wages. It has been described as a "... self-imposed levy on landlords to prevent the poor from dying of starvation,"⁴² and is commonly known as the "Speenhamland Act" because it was first introduced in that place.⁴³ Basically, the system which Arnold considered to be immoral, meant that wages were subsidized out of the rates so that, in theory, everyone would have a living wage. In practice the large landowners deliberately kept wages down and the small farmers found themselves helping, via the rates, to pay for other men's employed help. Speenhamland was originated with the best of motives, but it did far more harm than good. Except in some of the northern shires the labourers of all England were pauperized, and

when hope and self-respect had fled, crime made his seat on the hearth. In the era of Waterloo rick-burning was a common form of vengeance that often had the secret sympathy of the whole village, while highway robbery and thieving in barns was resorted to with dreadful frequency as a means of subsistence. But the particular crime most deeply resented and most severely punished by legislators and magistrates was regarded by the bulk of the population as no crime at all: to the man whom society had made a pauper malgre lui it must often have seemed that to snare hares and net partridges at risk to his personal safety was the most honourable part of the grim and sordid life in which he strove against fate to find food for wife and child. Poaching brought a gleam of romance and joyous living into the life of the disinherited peasant.⁴⁴

The game laws were severe when George III came to the throne, but were increasing in severity when he died. Poachers were transported for terms of many years and the cruel mantrap and spring-gun were introduced.⁴⁵ There were bands of professional poachers roaming the

countryside and they and the landlords would engage in pitched battles in the woods at night. On a much smaller scale, Arnold was involved in trying to stop his pupils from poaching in the fields and woods round Rugby.

The Enclosure Acts contributed to the worsening condition of the rural workers, but so did the fact that England had led the world since the accession of George III in the scientific progress of agriculture. Stock-breeding, for instance, had become highly specialized, and required fewer workers. This side-product of less manual help being required was a result of most of the improvements that were made. By 1801, Arthur Young, the man most responsible for the improvements and the enclosures, was forced to admit that "by nineteen out of twenty Enclosure Bills the poor are injured and most grossly."⁴⁶ On the other hand, the farmers who managed to increase their holdings and take advantage of the new methods to improve their estates were able to make money, and in some cases, a lot of money. The enclosures increased the food supply and the national wealth, but the poor saw little of the increase which went, in the main, to the landlord and, as tithes, to the Church as well as the big farmers.

A collapse of prices in 1814-16 led to the infamous Corn Laws of 1815 being passed. Like the Speenhamland policy, the Corn Law was passed with the best of intentions, but the results were dire, and again the poor felt the brunt of the evil. The Corn Law prohibited the import of corn till the price of wheat rose above eighty shillings a quarter, an extremely high price. It came about because the land-

owners were still in control of the legislature and they sought to protect themselves against the sudden and drastic fall in prices. Many farmers went bankrupt, thus depriving the landowners of their rents and as many of the landowners were already heavily mortgaged, in the expectation of continuing high prices, they wanted protection against the import of cheap foreign corn. The price of wheat, and therefore of bread, was kept artificially high and the poor found that their small amount of money bought even less than it might have done. Arnold believed the Corn Laws should be repealed, but realised it was only a partial answer to the problems of the poor.⁴⁷

By 1815 England was midway through the most far-reaching social transformation in her history and the Corn Laws, the Speenhamland policy and the other attempts to adjust to the new climate were mainly well-intentioned, but misguided efforts. 1815 was also the year in which Arnold became a Fellow at Oriel College, Oxford and wrote a prize-winning essay entitled: "The Effects of Distant Colonization on the Parent State." Already social conditions were claiming the attention of this man who was to spend much of his life working for the poor.

A grim picture has been painted of the conditions under which men, women and children were employed in the new factories, and under which they lived in the new towns.⁴⁸ However, modern scholarship suggests that life, although bad, may not have been as dreadful as has been thought hitherto.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, even if this be true, some of the details of the early part of the nineteenth century are shocking. Children under five years of age worked in complete

darkness, alone, in the coal mines. Women, with a belt round their waists and a chain between their legs, crawled along the pit bottom dragging carts through water, often up to their thighs. Accidents were frequent and, up to 1815, it was, in Durham and Northumberland, not "the custom...to hold inquests on the victims of the innumerable accidents."⁵⁰

It has been said that this was an age of reform, and certainly the conditions under which the factory employees lived and worked needed reform. A number of Reform Bills did gradually ameliorate their working conditions. Notable among these were the series of Factory Acts which began in 1802. The first of these Acts were very limited in scope. The 1819 Act, for instance, applied only to the cotton industry and forbade night work for children and limited day work to twelve hours. There was, however, no provision for ensuring that the terms of the Act were carried out. In the 1833 Act, which forbade child-labour under the age of nine altogether, restricted it to nine hours for those below thirteen and to twelve for those under eighteen years of age, salaried inspectors were provided for, in order to enforce the law.⁵¹ In a number of publications Arnold stressed the problems of the workers and called for improvement in the conditions under which they lived and worked.

Towns were being built in frantic haste, with no thought to sanitation or to aesthetic considerations. The housing conditions of both rural and urban dwellers were varied, but often bad, a fact which Arnold deplored. He offered sensible, practical alternatives in his writings to the ready-made slums that were being built. The rapid

increase in population and the greater mobility of people worsened a state of affairs that, certainly by twentieth century standards, was often appalling. Dirt and stench had always been part of town life and, as yet, the connection between dirt and disease was imperfectly understood. It was not until 1846 that Doulton began to manufacture cheap glazed earthenware pipes that could be used for sewage disposal. Thus cholera and similar diseases could, and did, spread unchecked. On one occasion a number of deaths at Rugby caused the school to be closed down and Arnold took the Sixth form to his Westmoreland home.

Pitt's Combination Acts made it impossible for the workers to co-operate and take any concerted action in order to improve their lot. The employers were able to come to agreements that affected the workers but any attempt by workmen to combine for their own protection was put down with a firm hand by the government, who saw such groupings as threats to public peace. Arnold, in common with many people, was violently opposed to the Trades Unions because he saw them as illegal attempts to take the law into the workers' hands. Both the government and the people, especially the upper and middle classes, lived in almost constant fear of revolution. Arnold was no exception to this rule and his distress was, at times, very great. The thought of the French Revolution was in everyone's mind and the dread of "Jacobinism" something with which people lived.⁵² Disraeli published Sybil, or the Two Nations, in 1845, but the class-war he describes is one that had been fought many years before. In 1819 the infamous Peterloo massacre⁵³ provided a startling and excessive demonstration

of the state of that "war." For a number of reasons, the concessions that were made, the increasing prosperity, the temper of the people and many more, England was spared a full-scale revolution like that of France.

The end of the war marked the commencement of an era of prosperity and power, but it was accompanied by a period of remarkable social distress and unrest, of economic crises and political change. The new wealth and world supremacy that England now enjoyed rested on foundations of harsh, sweated labour, appalling slum conditions and immense human misery, cut-throat competition and inhuman exploitation.⁵⁴

The generation of Englishmen between 1815 and 1850 suffered from the combined aftermath of two great social and political revolutions, the American and the French; of two great social and economic upheavals, the agrarian and the industrial revolutions; of two great foreign wars, the French Revolutionary and the Napoleonic Wars (1793-1815) ...the period...is one of strenuous activity and dynamic change, of ferment of ideas and recurrent social unrest, of great inventiveness and expansion...of a people engaged in a tremendously exciting adventure--the daring experiment of fitting industrial man into a democratic society.⁵⁵

If the agrarian and industrial revolutions were not quite as sudden and cataclysmic as is often thought, and if the conditions of life for most people were not as bad as has been believed, and even if the people did not realise just how great the changes were through which they were living, this was still a period of turbulence and turmoil at the brink of the modern era. Arnold of Rugby worked in the religious, the political, the social and the educational fields in order to contribute his share to making that transition easier than it might be. He expressed views in his writings; he acted in a practical way, by setting up a dispensary,

for instance, as well as giving lectures in the Mechanics' Institute and distributing leaflets with advice on combating the cholera. He tried, with little success, to inaugurate a society that would gather figures on the exact state of the poor, so that effective measures could be taken.

It is in the area of education, however, that Arnold has become most famous. He is known as Arnold of Rugby and to him has been credited the reformation of the Public Schools. Education for all social classes was in a state of flux during Arnold's lifetime, and it was not only in the Public Schools that changes were made.

The changes in the character, scope, and extension of schools and universities throughout the United Kingdom between 1815 and 1870 might well be taken as the central feature of the age of reform. These changes, which affected the manners, outlook, and capacity of every class in society, were part of the general movement towards a higher standard of life. Furthermore, while the political and administrative measures of the time were directed towards a better arrangement of things, the educational reformers aimed at the improvement of people, though by increasing the supply of persons qualified to serve the administrative and technical needs of an industrial society they were solving a problem as practical as the problems solved by the engineers. The new schools were as necessary as the new machine tools and the new railways.⁵⁶

There were, however, despite the importance that is placed on education today, deep-seated prejudices against educational reform; an indifference in some quarters that was as bad; and religious rivalries which militated against any concerted effort.

There were some members of the new age who saw no immediate commercial benefits from education, but were aware of the costs. They had difficulty appreciating the values of an education for the working classes, but believed that labour unrest must surely follow. It was thought that technical efficiency was learned "on the

job" and the schools were not going to be able to offer anything that would increase the useful skills of the artisan and engineer. The Church of England and the Nonconformists were each unwilling to allow the field of education to fall to the other. Compulsory education was considered, in this age of laissez-faire, to be an attack upon the liberty of the individual, and, in the same way, education sponsored by the government was an encroachment on individual rights, and was out of tune with prevailing feeling. So, elementary education was left in the hands of religious societies.

The first stage in the development of elementary education was the Sunday School. The Society for the Establishment and Support of Sunday Schools in the Different Counties of England was formed in 1785. The Sunday Schools taught the children to read the bible. The "dangerous"⁵⁷ subjects of writing and arithmetic were usually not taught, especially in the early years of the nineteenth century, because it was felt that such a degree of knowledge would produce a disinclination among the poor for the laborious occupations.⁵⁸ Within two years the Society had 250,000 pupils in Great Britain; by 1801 there were 156,490 in London alone. Part of their success may be attributed to the fact that both parents and employers encouraged them. School on Sundays did not interfere with the children's earning capacity, who worked on the other six days of the week. Arnold was so concerned about these children that he took over the Sunday School at Laleham.

A powerful impulse to the provision of schools on a large scale was given by the foundation of two great educational organizations, the British and Foreign Society (1808) and the National Society for

Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church (1811).⁵⁹ The people who supported these two voluntary organizations did so from a mixture of motives, ranging from pure charity to a fear of the dangers afforded by an illiterate and ever-increasing urban population. The dissenters, led by Joseph Lancaster,⁶⁰ formed the British and Foreign Society, with Whig patronage, and provided an education using the monitorial system, based on undenominational bible-teaching. The other Society was supported by the members of the Church of England, and it offered an education based on the monitorial system of Andrew Bell⁶¹ which was often called the Madras system, but which differed very little from that used by Lancaster.

The result of the rivalry between the two societies was that by 1818 as many as 600,000 children, out of a possible two million, were in attendance at a school of some sort. By 1832 the National Society had 12,000 schools in operation. However, the great factory districts were virtually untouched by the societies, mainly because the children were employed in the mills and workshops and had no time for formal education.⁶²

There was little progress towards a national system of public education before 1867, although there was gradual acceptance of the need for state aid and supervision. The first grant of public money was made in 1833, when £20,000 was shared between the two major societies and used by them to build schools, although the grant could only be used when half the money was provided by voluntary contributions. The grant was an important precedent, for it became annual

after that date. In the thirties a number of Bills were introduced into the House attempting to form a central controlling authority and also set up a State teachers' training college, but all were defeated because of the religious difficulties and opposition. In an attempt to solve some of the problems, a Committee of the Privy Council was set up in 1839. Being a Crown appointment, the Committee by-passed the need for an Act of Parliament, but was nearly stopped by a vote of protest which came within five votes of being passed (280-275). This Committee was the forerunner of the present Ministry. It had as its first secretary Dr. J. Kay, later Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, one of the most important figures in the development of English education.

There were still Dames Schools in the early nineteenth century, but, on the whole, they were "little more than baby-minding establishments."⁶³ Common day schools were also still to be found, but they were beyond the financial reach of many people and the education they offered was minimal in many cases. The charity schools of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge were still operating, but the standards varied considerably, and if Mrs. Trimmer is to be believed, were generally bad by this time.⁶⁴

Another type of free education for the very poor was the school of industry, in which children from a very early age were taught such things as spinning, winding, knitting, plaiting straw, sewing, cobbling shoes and gardening. The sale of the products of the children's work paid the expenses of the school, gave the children meals, and in a few cases, provided them with small wages. Beyond their utilitarian work, the children were usually taught some religion and sometimes given instruction in reading.⁶⁵

Adult education received its first major stimulus from the desire of the mechanics for scientific knowledge. A number of middle class people were prepared to help them satisfy this desire. From 1823 Mechanics' Institutes spread throughout industrial England. The Mechanics' Magazine was published, and by 1824 sold 16,000 copies. The workmen paid one guinea a year to belong to the Mechanics' Institutes. The mechanics were usually better paid than their fellows, were often more intelligent and had a greater respect shown them by their employers, who needed their technical knowledge. It was these men who took the lead in educational and political movements. They invited prominent lecturers to their Institutes and Arnold gave several lectures to the Rugby Mechanics' Institute.

Secondary education for the poor at this time was non-existent. For the middle and upper classes there were private schools, grammar schools and public schools. Many of the private schools were established because the rising middle classes wanted a form of education more in keeping with their ideals and needs than could be provided by the Public Schools and the grammar schools, which were bound by outdated statutes. The private schools offered greater supervision of the children, usually mechanical teaching methods and a certain respectability, as well as a curriculum that was not exclusively Latin and Greek. The grammar schools were mostly of ancient foundation, but were tied by their statutes which defined and delimited their curricula and the salaries of the staff that could be paid. The curricula were limited, in most cases, to the classics, and a ruling by Lord Eldon in 1805 that the statutes were binding in this respect meant that

a school which had been founded three hundred years before to teach Latin and Greek, could still teach only Latin and Greek.

The Public Schools were, basically, little different from the grammar schools, but had managed to remain reasonably, or in some cases, very, affluent. They took boarders and had become class-conscious, catering for the middle and upper classes almost solely. Their curricula were still restricted to the classics, but other subjects could be obtained as "extras." The classical curriculum, however, was only one of the many problems facing the Public Schools at the time Arnold went to Rugby, and by far the greatest was the reputation they had as places of vice and corruption. Certainly this was the one aspect that Arnold set out to change, and the one with which he is most closely connected in the field of Education.

The private schools, not being bound by outmoded statutes, were able to introduce innovations in a way that was denied to the older establishments. Many of these private schools were founded by reformers who were dissatisfied with the older schools and therefore quite naturally provided a contrast to the established forms of secondary education. As in so many aspects of life at the time, education was being subjected to considerable experimentation and it was possible to find almost any kind of school that one wanted.

It is often forgotten that they (Public Schools) comprised only one of a great variety of systems based on diverse views of the twin aspects of school life, discipline and curriculum. It was indeed a great period of experimentation. There were schools which flogged the boys unmercifully (sic) and others where the cane was forbidden; there were those where the headmaster was a tyrant and others where the boys, by design, ruled themselves. The same thing can be said of the curriculum. There were

schools which taught nothing but the classics, others that taught everything else but the classics; some that geared the pupils to their lot in society, others which divorced youth from society altogether. In a kind of mean position, many commercial schools and academies had a curriculum and a timetable almost indistinguishable from those of the grammar school today.

... It would have been impossible for anyone to have created something new, for all the possibilities were already exhausted and it was theoretically possible for any father with money to pick his ideal of education from the array offered.⁶⁶

The Public Schools, however, were restricted in their curriculum by the fact that one of their prime aims was to prepare boys for entrance to the universities, and as examinations became more prevalent in the Colleges, so the schools' curricula were further restricted.

The universities, Oxford and Cambridge, were not immune from criticism from the reform-minded, and in fact, the condition to which they had sunk invited criticism. Attempts at reform, however, were involved in religious and political controversies which militated against anything being done quickly and efficiently. The colleges, which were completely independent bodies, were jealous of their status and deeply resentful of any outside interference. The governing bodies were largely comprised of elderly gentlemen who were content with the status quo. The universities were poor, although some of the colleges were rich, and the relationship between college and university was not such as to allow reforms to be carried through easily. Many of the colleges had statutory restrictions upon their members, so that often fellowships, scholarships and places in the colleges were restricted to founder's kin, or to people educated at a certain school or who were born in a certain locality, a practice which tended to keep the standards low.

Nevertheless some reforms were carried out. From 1795 Oriel, the College in which Arnold became a Fellow, had a system of electing Fellows from outside its own body by examination, and while it was a prime example, it was not alone, nor was it the first of the colleges to do so.

Written examinations, and a real viva voce examination instead of the formal disputation, were established for the degree of B. A. at Oxford in 1800, and an honours list was added to the ordinary pass school. Mathematics and physics became a separate school in 1807, and in 1830 different subjects of examination were prescribed for pass and honours candidates. The Cambridge mathematical tripos had a high reputation long before 1815; a separate classical tripos was instituted in 1824, though, until 1850, it was open only to honours graduates in mathematics.⁶⁷

For many people the religious exclusiveness of the universities was a major source of concern. At Oxford it was impossible to matriculate unless one subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles of religious belief of the Church of England. Nonconformists were permitted at Cambridge, but were ineligible for scholarships, fellowships and, most unfortunate of all, degrees. The universities were training grounds for the Anglican clergy; attendance at chapel was compulsory and any attempts at secularisation were met with determined resistance. Arnold, devout Churchman that he became, had grave doubts and scruples about signing the Thirty-nine Articles, and it was only after much soul-searching that he did so.

The Public Schools, through the centuries, had, for reasons which remain obscure, become very largely the preserves of the aristocracy, and the boys took to school the leisure pursuits they enjoyed at home. At the turn of the century the aristocracy spent much of their leisure time in the country, hunting, shooting and

angling. The enclosures had made, and were making, the English countryside peculiarly suitable for hunting on horseback, with its well-drained fields, plentiful obstacles and lack of barriers. The rigid and severe Game Laws excluded all but the aristocracy from these sports. Only the squire, or his eldest son, was permitted, by law, to kill game, even at the invitation of the landowner. This prohibition was not repealed until 1831.

The sporting events that drew large crowds, including the gentry, were horse-racing, prize-fighting and pedestrian races and exploits. Horse-racing had first achieved popularity at Newmarket, partly due to the Royal patronage of Charles II. Other race-courses were built, based on the Newmarket model, and the sport flourished. Of the five Classics in horse-racing two are run at Newmarket, and, oddly enough, were the last to be inaugurated.⁶⁸ Horse-racing drew crowds of up to twenty thousand, and included the usual number of ruffians and ne'er-do-wells, yet the races were well run; the sport, under the auspices of the Jockey Club (ca. 1750) carefully controlled. As in so many sports, the Jockey Club became the ruling body almost incidentally. Originally it was simply an informal dining club of gentlemen, but the members were so influential that the Club adopted, and had thrust upon it, the authority necessary to control the sport. By the end of the eighteenth century it had become powerful enough to warn off the Prince Regent, whose jockey was suspected of unfair practices. The Ascot meet was popular before the end of the eighteenth century and steeplechasing on regular courses increased in popularity; the Grand National was first run at Aintree in 1839.

Prize-fighting was at its height during the Regency (1811-20).

When the date and place of a prize-fight had been announced, hordes set out, riding and walking to the spot from all parts of the island. Sometimes twenty thousand spectators assembled. In one aspect these vast outdoor assemblies were festivals of the common people. But the priests of the national cult were fashionable members of the aristocracy, who presided over the ceremonies and held the rough and often turbulent multitude in awe. It was these men of fashion and rank who hired and backed the gladiators. . . . Their lordly patrons were proud to be seen driving with them to the ring-side in coach or gig.⁶⁹

Some of the brutality of former years was already disappearing by the turn of the century. Boxing-gloves, or muffles, were in use then and the Broughton Rules were still the accepted code. The Regent set the seal of royal approval on the sport by having a guard of honour comprised of prize-fighters, led by Gentleman John Jackson, at his coronation in 1820, when he became George IV.

Wagering was an essential part of life, and pedestrianism gave ample opportunity for bets, large and small, to be placed. These events, walking, running, or sometimes a combination of both, were held between competitors, usually two, or quite often one man and the clock. The competitors ranged throughout the social scale and some of the feats they performed are outstanding. Captain Barclay Allardice, in 1809, won one thousand guineas for walking one thousand miles in one thousand successive hours at the rate of one mile in each and every hour.⁷⁰

The poorer classes disported themselves in a number of ways, and if they were denied the pleasures of hunting and shooting, they could still enjoy themselves at the numerous fairs, and indulge in various athletic competitions as well as gape at the wonders of the



Greatest Show on Earth. Among the amusements with which they passed their time were jingling, a game in which one man with his hands tied and a bell round his neck was chased, within a roped ring, by a dozen or so young men who were blindfolded; climbing the greasy pole; muzzling in a flour-tub; and backswording. This last, in which the competitors were called old gamesters, was a contest using good stout ash sticks with a large basket handle. The object was to defend oneself and attempt to break the skin on the opponent's head, causing the blood to flow. The method of signifying one's intention to participate was to throw one's hat into the ring. Wrestling was also a favourite, although the rules varied considerably from one part of the country to another. The youngsters had sack-races and wheelbarrow races and there would be donkey races as well as feats of strength for the men.⁷¹ In some parts mob football, a wild and unruly game, would be played, often on specified days, such as Shrove Tuesday.⁷²

The spirit of reform was seen in sports as well as other aspects of life at the turn of the century. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was formed in 1824, but Richard "Humanity" Martin, failed repeatedly to get Parliament to ban cruel sports such as bull-baiting and dog-fighting. It was not until 1835 that his efforts bore nation-wide success. Cock-fighting was losing its appeal among the gentry quite early in the century, but persisted among the lower classes until very late, and even among the more disreputable members of the upper classes.

Betting was not restricted to prize-fighting and horse-racing, even cricket was not immune. Cricket and golf were the only games



that had any uniformity of rules and any form of governing body, in the early part of the new century. Both were aristocratic games, although not exclusively and the Marylebone Cricket Club (M. C. C.) was established as the leading club quite soon after the turn of the century. The Royal and Ancient Golf Club of St. Andrews, like the M. C. C. and the Jockey Club, was not set up to be the governing body of golf, but the prestige of its members gradually made it the arbiter.

As the century progressed more and more sports were organised under effective governing bodies. Sports became less haphazard and more rigidly controlled in a way which reflected the changes in the life of the times and in the moral attitudes. In part the greater stress on organisation was a result of the increasingly higher standards of organisation in people's work. Organisation and strictly enforced rules were necessary in the new factories, both in order to maintain output, and also to raise safety standards. People became used to organisation and applied their new-found standards to their sports.⁷³

The rising power, affluence and influence of the middle-classes, who were often engaged in manufacturing, made a vast change in the sporting life of the country. The aristocratic pastimes of hunting, shooting and angling, tended to remain Barbarian, but the middle-classes developed football, hockey and athletics, or track-and-field events, as well as swimming, rowing and cycling into sports which suited their peculiar tastes. Lawn tennis was invented by the middle-classes for the middle-classes. By the end of the nineteenth century sport in England was predominantly a middle-class phenomenon.⁷⁴

It was in the reformed Public Schools that the change from Barbarian to Philistine sports was most obvious and could be most clearly witnessed.⁷⁵ The Public Schools were reformed along middle-class lines for the children of middle-class people, and the games and sports of the schools changed from aristocratic pastimes to middle-class games; from unrestricted, unsupervised individual activities to bounded, supervised, team games. This change both aided the change in the sporting life of the country and was symptomatic of it. With the different sports and emphases came the rise to prominence of the first-class amateur and the professional coach in cricket. Football became an acceptable sport for the sons of gentlemen and the cult of athleticism spread from the Public Schools to the country as a whole. By the end of the century the expression, "It's not cricket" had ceased to have a sporting, and had acquired a moral connotation; the Barbarian pursuits of hunting and steeplechasing had been transformed into cross-country runs, hare-and-hounds and hurdle-races; and gymnasia had been built at many schools.

It has been said that this transformation was started by Dr. Thomas Arnold during his tenure at Rugby from 1828 to 1842. It is obvious, however, that the movement was too great, too all-encompassing to have been solely the work of one man. The ethos of the times was particularly suitable for the rise of a games-cult and the demise of the freer, aristocratic pursuits. There were many social, economic and political pressures which affected Arnold and his way of thinking, but which also affected other men in the field of education and, perhaps even more important, affected those who were sending

their sons to the Public Schools. The regeneration of the schools was due to the needs of the middle classes as they assumed an ever-increasing position of power in the country. The greater emphasis on games was a manifestation of middle-class values, which could be seen operating in other aspects of life also. The pastimes which became popular were products of an industrialised community that was fast becoming boundary-conscious, rule-conscious and aware of its responsibilities to the individual members of the community. The games of the period, as it might be said of those of any society at any time, were a reflection of the mores of the society. The change from the aristocratic to the middle-class values was swift and complete, but then so was the change from an agrarian, aristocratically-ruled society to one that was industrial and dominated by men whose fortunes were in goods, not land.

In many ways Arnold was typical of his time. He welcomed the advent of the railways and thought that the changes that were taking place in turning England into an industrial nation were beneficial and were moving the country away from the concepts of feudalism, which he hated. He was a reformer par excellence in an age of reform. He was morally earnest in a period when moral earnestness was considered a great attribute. He was a compulsive worker at a time when work became almost a religion. He was a devout Christian when Christianity and the Church of England were undergoing a renaissance. In fact most of his character traits can be seen in the society as a whole, and it is this attribute that makes him an interesting figure of study and which enables his work to be seen in a much wider context.

NOTES

A number of basic texts have been used for this chapter and are listed below:

¹David Thomson, England in the Nineteenth Century, 1815-1914 (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1969).

G. M. Trevelyan, A Shortened History of England (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963).

G. M. Trevelyan, British History in the Nineteenth Century and After: 1782-1919 (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1965).

Sir Llewellyn Woodward, The Age of Reform: 1815-1870 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.)

A number of other sources have been consulted and are cited as necessary throughout the chapter.

²Woodward's book, op. cit., is a good example, being entitled The Age of Reform, 1815-1870; Sydney W. Jackman is rather less selective in his work, as he includes the whole of the nineteenth century in his title: The English Reform Tradition: 1790-1910. His work is a collection of articles by nineteenth century writers, including men like William Pitt, Shelley, Sir Robert Peel, Disraeli, William Morris and Richard Cobden, who were appealing for reform in one aspect or another of life in their time.

³A. P. Stanley, The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D., two volumes. Third edition. (London: B. Fellowes, 1844), Vol. I, p. 408. Letter to A. P. Stanley, dated Rugby, March 4, 1835. Letter no.: XCVIII.

The original of this letter is kept at the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, and a copy of part of it is included in this study.

⁴The Speenhamland Act: in May of 1795 the magistrates of Berkshire were summoned to meet at Speenhamland for the purpose of fixing and enforcing a living wage for the county in relation to the price of bread. Unfortunately the magistrates were persuaded not to enforce the raising of wages, but to supplement wages out of the parish rates, instead. They drew up and published a scale by which every poor and industrious person should receive from the parish enough to make up the deficiency of his wages to 3s. a week for himself, and 1/6d a week for every other member of his family. (A loaf of bread cost 1/- at this time!) As the cost of bread rose the handout was to rise with it. This scale was adopted across the country and became known as the Speenhamland Act, or the Speenhamland system. The result was that wages were kept unnaturally low. Employers did not pay the men

enough, so the local rates had to subsidise them. The small farmers also had to pay rates, and, in effect, were paying the employees of the large farmers. The only people who really benefited were the large landowners and farmers. It cost the small farmer money he could ill afford and pauperized the workers who lost their self-respect. The dole became the shameless rule, rather than the shameful exception that it had been. Even the mother of illegitimate children was offered a better income than the worker in the field.

The above is an adaptation of Trevelyan's discussion of the problem, Trevelyan, Nineteenth Century, op. cit., pp. 156-7.

⁵Thomson, op. cit., pp. 73-4.

For a detailed discussion of the many reforms in all aspects of life, see Woodward, op. cit., passim.

⁶Charles Moraze, The Triumph of the Middle Classes: A Study of European Values in the Nineteenth Century (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966), p. 93, says that when the suspension of Habeas Corpus came to an end in 1801, "a law of indemnity, retrospectively applied brought to book those officials and ministers who might possibly have abused it."

⁷Trevelyan, Shortened, op. cit., p. 413.

⁸See A. P. Stanley, ed. The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold (London: B. Fellowes, 1845). Letters to the Sheffield Courant, and the Hartford Reformer and extracts from The Englishman's Register, passim.

⁹See Woodward, op. cit., p. 79, including a footnote on that page, for details of the composition of Grey's cabinet.

¹⁰Rotten boroughs were those which still returned members to Parliament although the constituency had disappeared.

Pocket boroughs were those the representation of which was in the nomination of some person. i. e., the borough was in the person's pocket!

¹¹See Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., Extracts from The Englishman's Register, passim.

¹²Trevelyan, Shortened, op. cit., p. 475.

¹³See Stanley, Life, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 133, and also ibid., p. 156, letter to Sir T. Pasley, dated Rugby, May 10, 1839. Letter no: CCIII. Ibid., p. 175, letter to James Marshall, dated Rugby, October 30, 1839. Letter no: CCVIII. Ibid., pp. 183-5, letter to

J. C. Platt, dated Fox How, January 12, 1840. Letter no: CCXV. Ibid., pp. 188-191, letter to James Marshall, dated Fox How, January 23, 1840. Letter no: CCXVII.

See also Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., letters to the Sheffield Courant, particularly, pp. 476-8.

¹⁴For a short, but interesting discussion of the monarchy immediately before Victoria, and some of the differences that she made in the growth of the modern state, see Thomson, op. cit., pp. 169-174.

¹⁵Laissez-faire, a general principle of non-interference, such as governed British policy for many years.

¹⁶Thomson, op. cit., p. 30.

¹⁷See Stanley, Life, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 50-2, letter to A. P. Stanley, dated Rugby, October 21, 1836, letter no: CXXXIX, for an exposition of Arnold's views on the Benthamites.

¹⁸See Woodward, op. cit., p. 502. The whole paragraph is taken from this source.

¹⁹Pluralism: many clergymen held more than one living. Obviously they were unable to do a good job when their services were spread so thinly, even had they tried. Most of them made no attempt to perform their duties at any more than one place, simply drawing their stipend from the others.

Non-residence: was closely allied to pluralism. It meant that a clergyman was drawing a stipend while not living in his parish and not doing the job for which he was paid. In some cases this was not because he held more than one Church appointment, but because he held a Church appointment as a sinecure while working at some other job, such as teaching.

Nepotism: the practice of giving preferment to members of one's own family was rife in the Church at this time. "Bishop Sparke of Ely, his son, and his son-in-law enjoyed more than £30,000 a year of Church endowments. . . . Archbishop Manners-Sutton . . . presented seven of his relations to sixteen benefices;" Woodward, op. cit., p. 508. The number of such incidences could be multiplied ad infinitum.

²⁰One Archbishop of Canterbury is said to have left a million pounds, and to have provided his elder son with £12,000 a year and his younger son with £3,000 a year from benefices and other offices. Woodward, op. cit., p. 508.

²¹Ibid., p. 509.

²²Ibid., p. 510. Woodward offers a good discussion of the tithe's question here.

²³Ibid. "A second report, published in 1836, advised the limitation of cathedral chapters to a dean and four residentiary canons, and the use of the revenues of stalls and offices beyond this number for the augmentation of poor livings.

²⁴Ibid., p. 512.

²⁵The names "Latitudinarians" and "Broad Church" are used interchangeably, although there were people at the time who might have accepted the one while rejecting the idea of being called by the other. The Broad Church was not a party in the same sense that the Low Church and the High Church were. "It was simply a direction of opinion, a tendency, we might even say in the widest sense of the term a group, within which several subordinate groups may be more or less roughly distinguished." Elie Halevy, A History of the English People, Vol. IV., p. 316, as quoted in Thomson, op. cit., p. 109.

²⁶The Tractarian Movement is another name for the Oxford Movement. The first name was given to the group because they published their views during the thirties in a series of Tracts, culminating in Tract 90, written by Newman, in which he tried to show that the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England originated with the Roman Church prior to the Reformation. If this were accepted it would mean that there was no basic difference between the two Churches. The Tract, and Newman, were condemned on all sides, and the Oxford Movement, as such, virtually died, but its spirit lingered on.

²⁷Stanley, Life, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 286. Letter to an old pupil, dated Rugby, October 30, 1841. Letter no: CCLXXXIII.

²⁸Thomson, op. cit., pp. 108-9.

²⁹See Trevelyan, Nineteenth Century, op. cit., p. 15. Much of this section is taken from this work, especially the Introduction, pp. 15-18.

³⁰Most of the examples of inventions given in this section have been culled from the pages of Edwin Emerson, Jr., and Marion Mills Miller, The Nineteenth Century and After (New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1906), passim.

³¹Thomson, op. cit., pp. 12-3.

³²Ibid., p. 13.

³³The Enclosure Acts were a succession of Acts which removed large tracts of land from public possession. People were given compensation for the loss of their rights, but often this was insufficient. The enclosures were responsible for turning a great deal of land from wastes and open fields to the chessboard of hedge and ditch which is still a prominent feature of the English countryside.

³⁴See Thomson, op. cit., p. 11, and Peter Mathias, The First Industrial Nation: An Economic History of Britain 1700-1914. (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1969) pp. 190-1 and 198-200.

³⁵Thomson, op. cit., p. 12.

³⁶David Newsome, A History of Wellington College 1859-1959 (London: John Murray, 1959), pp. 8-9.

³⁷The union of Great Britain and Ireland took place in 1814.

³⁸Thomson, op. cit., p. 26.

³⁹See Sydney W. Jackman, ed., The English Reform Tradition 1790-1910 (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965) Introduction, passim and pp. 3-4 in particular.

⁴⁰The Clapham Sect was a group of reformers headed by such men as William Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay and Granville Sharp, whose greatest work came when they enlisted the support of the Prime Minister, William Pitt, to abolish the slave trade.

⁴¹See Trevelyan, Nineteenth Century, op. cit., p. 155, for a discussion of the problems of the dispossessed small farmers.

⁴²Ibid., p. 159.

⁴³See footnote 4.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 157-8.

⁴⁵Man-traps and spring-guns were made illegal in 1827, but poaching and punishments continued. In the period 1828-30, inclusive, over 8,500 convictions were made under the game laws. Poaching diminished as the game laws became more humane. See ibid., p. 158.

⁴⁶Quoted in ibid., p. 153.

⁴⁷See Stanley, Life, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 293-6, letter to John Ward, dated Rugby, April 27, 1831. Letter no: XXVIII, and ibid., Vol. II, pp. 183-5, letter to J. C. Matt, dated Fox Howe, January 12, 1840. See also Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., letters to newspapers and extracts from The Englishman's Register, passim.

⁴⁸See, for example, Trevelyan, op. cit., Chapter 9, passim, and E. J. Hobsbawm, "The British Standard of Living, 1790-1850," (Economic History Review, 2nd series, Vol. X, No: 1, 1957), pp. 46-68.

⁴⁹Woodward, op. cit., pp. 1-50, passim, describes conditions in a much more positive and cheerful manner, without obscuring the fact that, for some, life was a terrible experience.

See also T. S. Ashton, "The Standard of Life of Workers in England, 1790-1830," (Supplement IX to the Journal of Economic History, 1949), pp. 19-38].

⁵⁰Trevelyan, Nineteenth Century, op. cit., p. 164.

⁵¹Brinton, et al, op. cit., p. 220.

⁵²The principles of the French Revolutionists were called "Jacobinism" because one society of revolutionists used to meet in a hall of the Jacobin convent. Thus, Jacobinism in the early years of the nineteenth century in England meant the revolutionary spirit, such as that which led to the storming of the Bastille in Paris and to numerous riots in England.

⁵³The so-called Peterloo Massacre came about when some 60,000 people assembled in St. Peter's Fields in Manchester in 1819, mainly in order to listen to the famous radical orator, Hunt. The mounted yeomanry was sent out by the magistrates to arrest Hunt. They charged the crowd! The upshot was eleven people dead and four hundred wounded, including over one hundred women. The Tories lost much of the credit they had built up because of Waterloo, by virtue of the debacle at St. Peter's Fields.

⁵⁴Thomson, op. cit., p. 32.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 33.

⁵⁶Woodward, op. cit., p. 474.

⁵⁷In a Commons debate in 1807, Mr. Giddy said: "However specious in theory the project might be of giving education to the labouring classes of the poor, it would be prejudicial to their morals and happiness; it would teach them to despise their lot in life instead of making them good servants in agriculture or other labourious employments; instead of teaching them subordination it would render them fractious and refractory, as was evident in the manufacturing counties; it would enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity; it would render them insolent to their superiors; and in a few years the legislature would find it necessary to direct the strong arm of power towards them." Quoted in Trevelyan, Nineteenth Century, op. cit., pp. 168-9, footnote.

See also ibid., p. 169, where Trevelyan says: "...the propagation of the dangerous art of writing..." (my emphasis) and, H. C. Barnard, A Short History of English Education, from 1760-1944 (London: University of London Press, 1947), pp. 65-6.

⁵⁸Barnard, loc. cit.,

⁵⁹Board of Education, The Education of the Adolescent: Report of the Consultative Committee (London: H. M. S. O. 1927), p. 2.

⁶⁰Joseph Lancaster (1778-1838), was the son of a soldier. He was born in Southwark and served for a short time as a naval volunteer. Later he joined the Society of Friends (the Quakers). In 1801 he opened a school in Southwark and tried the monitorial system because he could not afford to pay assistants. Two years later he published an account of his school and his methods. In 1818 he emigrated to America where he stayed for the rest of his life. Lancaster is reputed to have been vain and unbalanced, but less mechanical than Bell in his methods, which he did not want to associate with denominational teaching. The monitorial systems of Lancaster and Bell simply involved teaching one group of children who then taught many others.

⁶¹Andrew Bell (1753-1832), was the son of a barber. He was born in St. Andrews, Scotland, and educated at St. Andrews University. He was ordained in the Church of England, and then, in 1787, went to India, where, as superintendent of the Madras Male Orphan Asylum (1789) he began the plan of using the elder children to teach the juniors. He published an account of his system in 1797. In 1801 he became the Rector of Swanage, where he spent the majority of his time spreading his teaching methods, and superintending the work of the National Society. Bell is reputed to have been a domineering and conceited man with a great love of money.

⁶²Trevelyan, Nineteenth Century, op. cit., p. 171.

⁶³Barnard, op. cit., p. 3.

⁶⁴Mrs. Sarah Trimmer, Reflections on the Education of Children in Charity Schools (London: 1792), p. 19.

⁶⁵See Barnard, op. cit., Chapter I, for a discussion of the various forms of elementary schooling at the turn of the century.

⁶⁶T. W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London: The Cresset Press, 1960), p. 200.

⁶⁷Woodward, op. cit., pp. 489-90.

⁶⁸The Classics are: at Doncaster--the St. Leger (1778); at Epsom--the Oaks (1779) and the Derby (1780); and at Newmarket--the Two Thousand Guineas (1809) and the One Thousand Guineas (1814). Most of the information detailed here on leisure-time activities is taken from P. C. McIntosh, Sport in Society (London: C. A. Watts & Co., Ltd., 1968), Chapter VI, passim.

⁶⁹Trevelyan, English Social History, p. 503, as quoted in Thomson, op. cit., p. 19.

⁷⁰McIntosh, Sport, op. cit., pp. 60-1, recounts this story.

⁷¹See Thomas Hughes, Tom Brown's School-days, Chapter II for a good account of a fair in the early days of the nineteenth century. It is from this book that most of the discussion in this text on fairs was taken.

⁷²Shrove Tuesday is the day before Ash Wednesday, which is the first day of Lent, the period preceding Easter which Christians observe as a fast, in commemoration of Christ's fast in the wilderness. Shrove Tuesday is often called Pancake Tuesday as it was customary to eat rich pancakes on that day as a preparation for the fast to come. Nowadays the pancakes are still eaten, but the fast has fallen into abeyance. Quite why football should have been played on this day is unknown, although the custom would seem to pre-date Christianity and was probably a Spring ritual.

⁷³McIntosh, Sport, op. cit., p. 63, gives a table showing the development of sporting organisations from the founding of the Jockey Club, circa 1750 to that of the Amateur Fencing Association, in 1898.

⁷⁴See McIntosh, Sport, op. cit., Chapter VI, passim.

⁷⁵The name "Barbarians" to mean the aristocracy was first used by Matthew Arnold in his book, Culture and Anarchy, first published in 1869. He popularised the name "Philistines," meaning the middle classes, in the same work, although the term had been used before. The working classes he designated "the Populace." See Chapter III of Culture and Anarchy for Arnold's discussion of the terms.

A modern edition of the work is edited by Dover Wilson and published by the Cambridge University Press. In this edition the discussion appears on pp. 100-102.

PART II

ARNOLD AND RUGBY SCHOOL

CHAPTER III

ARNOLD'S LIFE AND BELIEFS

... he rises before us like an inspired prophet, preaching to every schoolmaster the sacredness of his calling, and bidding him always remember that formation of character is the primary aim of every good teacher, that it is the duty of the teacher to hasten growth out of the immature and dangerous period of boyhood,

J. J. Findlay.

The period in which Arnold lived was an age of reform. As a man who was acutely aware of the intellectual and social currents of his time and was moulded by them, Arnold was a reformer. He wanted to reform the Church; he wanted to reform Parliament; he wanted to reform the electoral system; he wanted to reform the conditions of the poor; he has been credited with reforming the Public Schools.

Before he was eleven years of age he had determined to be a clergyman when he grew up. When he was only fourteen he wrote home decrying the "nefarious forgeries and worldly conduct of the Christian bishops," and the "vices and follies" of the lesser clergy.¹ He retained his desire to be a priest until close to the time when he was to be ordained, but then he began to have doubts about signing the Thirty-nine Articles. In order to be a priest he had to accept these articles of religious belief which distinguished the Church of England from all other Churches. Quite suddenly, after more than three years of studying theology as a Fellow of Oriel College, he realised that he could not accept all these tenets with a clear conscience. Eventually, the Bishop and his friends persuaded him to become a deacon and he was ordained on December 20, 1818. He still was not able to decide whether to continue to the fulfillment of his boyhood ambition and become a priest.

It was only in 1828, when he had accepted the position as headmaster of Rugby School, that he eventually took his D. D. degree. Until then his efforts to reform the Church were made from without. It was not until he was at Rugby that he achieved nation-wide

recognition as a religious reformer. His work before then was purely local. He preached in the village church at Laleham, where he and his brother-in-law had run a small preparatory school, and he had taken over the Sunday School from a woman whose drunkenness made her unfit for the position. His pupils had felt the effect of his attempts to make them into Christian gentlemen, but he had, as yet, not made a national name for himself. His ideas were being formed and he was expressing them. In 1826 he writes to a friend that the more he thinks of the matter of doing something about the Church

... and the more I read of the Scriptures themselves, and of the history of the Church, the more intense is my wonder at the language of admiration with which some men speak of the Church of England, which certainly retains the foundation sure, as all other Christian societies do, except the Unitarians, but has overlaid it with a very sufficient quantity of hay and stubble, which I devoutly hope to see burnt one day in the fire. I know that other churches have their faults also, but what have I to do with them. It is idle to speculate in aliena republica, but to reform one's own is a business which nearly concerns us.²

At this time the Church was under heavy criticism from many quarters, especially the Utilitarians.³

Arnold saw the need for internal reform of the Church but, unlike many people he wanted the Church to co-operate with the government. From about 1826, while he was still at Laleham, until his death he produced a variety of essays, pamphlets and letters urging, in essence, that the nation retain the Church establishment, that the Church reform its administration, and thereby make itself more popular, and that dissenters be incorporated in the Established Church. He attacked those who were trying to reassert the principles of ecclesiastical authority and tradition because he believed that they were jeopardising the future existence of the Church.⁴

In 1833 he published "Principles of Church Reform" which received sympathetic treatment from the Times⁵ although the local newspaper, the Northampton Herald, took the opportunity to denounce him as a centre of religious unrest, almost a heretic; as a man who wanted to attack the very heart of the Church of England by reducing or altering the Thirty-nine Articles, and as a traitor to the Church who wanted to throw open the pulpit of rectors to the ministers of Nonconformity.⁶ In this important work he tries to show, as he says:

...--that a Church Establishment is one of the greatest national blessings; that its benefits have been lessened, and are now in danger of being forfeited altogether, by its being based on too narrow a foundation, and being not so much the Church of England, as of a certain part only of the people of England; and that in order at once to secure it from destruction, and to increase its efficiency as an instrument of national good, it should be made more comprehensive in its doctrines, its constitution, and its ritual.⁷

Reaction to the pamphlet varied, but most people seemed to think its propositions were too "chimerical and impracticable."⁸

In time Arnold came to believe that simple internal reform of the Church would not be sufficient. In 1833 he wrote to the Archbishop of Dublin, Archbishop Whately,

Nothing, as it seems to me, can save the Church, but a union with the Dissenters; now they are leagued with the antichristian party, (presumably the Utilitarians) and no merely internal reforms in the administration of the actual system will, I think, or can satisfy them.⁹

Despite his attacks on the system, Arnold believed in the Established Church and his diatribes were intended to improve it, never to destroy it.

My conviction of the benefits of a Church Establishment arises from this: that thus, and thus only, can we ensure the dispersion of a number of well-educated men over the whole kingdom, whose

sole business, is to do good of the highest kind; to enforce in their public teaching, the purest principles and practice that mankind has ever yet been made acquainted with; and to exhibit all these in their own persons in all their daily intercourse with their neighbors, instructing the young, visiting the sick, relieving, advising, and maintaining the cause of the poor; and spreading amongst all ranks the wholesome influence of a good life, a cultivated understanding, and the feeling and manners of true gentleman.¹⁰

Believing that a Church Establishment is "essential to the well-being of the nation," Arnold felt that

the existence of Dissent impairs the usefulness of an Establishment always, and now from the peculiar circumstances threatens its destruction; and that to extinguish Dissent by persecution being both wicked and impossible, there remains the true, but hitherto untried way to extinguish it by comprehension;
¹¹

Arnold was quite prepared to see changes made in the Church's articles and creeds in order to make it easier for the dissenters to be included in the Church, because he felt that these were mere incidental trappings, that the real matters were a belief in God, in Christ and in the Bible as God's sole revelation to man. He believed that the Church should be integrated into the life of the people. He made practical proposals, such as dividing the existing dioceses into smaller units and making the present deaneries into bishoprics based on the new centres of population. Bishops, he thought, should be much more democratic than was the custom; they should not give pontifical decisions, but should act on the advice of a council, which would be comprised of both lay and clerical members. He even went so far as to suggest that diocesan general assemblies should be introduced. Idle clergy, and the so-called "sporting-clergy" should be removed altogether and the clerical ranks should be opened up to the lower classes and some appointments should

be reserved for them. The Church, Arnold thought, should be brought to the people, who should be made to realise that it belonged to them, that they were part of it. Therefore he advocated that the number of parishes be increased, the clergymen elected by popular vote and the general superintendence be left in the hands of lay and clerical officers. He repeatedly stressed that every attempt should be made to co-operate and ultimately fuse with the other Christian Churches.¹²

The reaction of the people with High Church leanings to Arnold's pamphlet was adverse and extreme. He represented everything that the Tractarians most detested: a broad view of the Church, a sympathy towards dissenters, a contempt for dogma and a willingness to advocate radical reforms in order to bring the Church into effective contact with the new and ever-growing industrial masses.¹³ On the other hand Arnold considered the Oxford men to be idolators, who placed the Church and the Sacraments above Christ and who wasted their time and great talents over irrelevant and futile problems instead of the main issues. For Arnold, the issues which should be taking every man's time were "the condition of our country; ... the poverty and wretchedness of so large a part of the working classes; ... the intellectual and moral evils which certainly exist among the poor ..."¹⁴ In this way too, Arnold was a man of his times.

Arnold's views on the Church and religion, as expressed in the pamphlet and elsewhere, were quite radical. For him Christ was everything. Anything that interfered with man's vision of Christ was evil. Even the Church, with its emphasis on ceremony and its hierarchical structure, was not sacrosanct. He argued that the Church

was a man-made structure paralleling that of the social hierarchy, with archbishops and palaces corresponding to kings and courts, which had acquired an authority belonging only to the Scriptures. Man did not need a priest to mediate between him and God according to Arnold:

Is it anything less than a positive blasphemy to require the mediation of an earthly priest between the Christian and his true divine Mediator? ¹⁵

In fact a priest was not even required for Holy Communion:

... as long as the true view of the Communion was retained, namely, that it was a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, in which every man offered himself also as a living and spiritual sacrifice to God, so long would the pretended necessity of a priestly mediation be seen to be false and profane. ¹⁶

In essence Arnold believed that priests were not necessary because any true Christian could conduct Holy Communion or baptise a person who repented and believed in Christ. Similarly any man could read the Bible and take from it the lessons he found there. ¹⁷

A distinction was made in Arnold's mind between a minister and a priest. The first is an invaluable member of the community who spends his life spreading the Gospel and helping the people. The second is something of a charlatan who practises a form of magic. ¹⁸ The Church is also an indispensable part of the community, but required much modification and reform.

Arnold was publishing his views at the time when the controversy between the theologians and the scientists, which reached great proportions after the publication of the Origin of the Species in 1859, was strengthening. The first volume of Sir Charles Lyell's work on geology, which demonstrated that the processes of nature had

developed gradually over long periods of time and suggested that the story of Genesis was historically inaccurate, was published in 1830.¹⁹ This work ran contrary to that of, for example, Archbishop Ussher, who had attempted to show that the Scriptures were consonant with history.

Arnold, in a series of publications from 1825 to the year of his death, 1842, set out to demonstrate that the bible was not historically discredited because it contained errors and was not plenary inspired; and that the primary value of the bible would not suffer from critical or scientific approaches.

It is only the INSPIRATION of the books of the Scripture, and not their general TRUTH, and far less the truth of the revelations recorded in them, that is, or can be, affected by the great majority of objections, critical, scientific, historical, and chronological, which have been brought at different times against various parts of the Bible. By the eagerness with which they have been urged and repelled, one would imagine that our Christian faith depended upon their issue, whereas in fact it has been totally unconcerned in the dispute.²⁰

In essence Arnold believed that whether or not the Scriptures were divinely inspired did not affect, necessarily, their authenticity. Therefore, to disprove their inspirational source did not automatically disprove their historicity. To equate credibility with inspiration would mean the rejection of all uninspired narratives as untrue, which is obviously ridiculous. If Arnold's defence is accepted then the bible is a fount of truth which cannot be attacked except by suggesting its moral teachings are obsolete.²¹

Many churchmen attacked Arnold bitterly for his views on the principles of individual responsibility for the moral application of the Scriptures, as opposed to acquiescence to interpretation by

ecclesiastical authority.²² By the time of his death, however, Arnold's views were beginning to be accepted. Shortly after his death, this acceptance spread rapidly, in part because of the work of men like his son, Matthew Arnold, his old pupils, such as Arthur Stanley, and friends and fellow-workers like Temple and Benjamin Jowett. Two main tenets of Arnold's philosophy, the belief that the Bible, although not infallible, was not historically discredited because of its human authors and the acceptance of the Bible as a never-ending source of moral guidance were widely adopted.²³

The fact that his views found this acceptance points to Arnold as being a man of his times, one who was affected by the intellectual currents of the age and responded to them in a way that was acceptable, even if not immediately, to his fellows.

Arnold's views on the Church and the State also brought him much abuse from many quarters, especially during the mid-thirties. At their best, Arnold thought, the Church and the State became one.

Civil society aims at the highest happiness of man according to the measure of its knowledge. Religious society aims at it truly and really, because it has obtained a complete knowledge of it. Impart then to civil society the knowledge of religious society, and the objects of both will be not only in intention but in fact the same. In other words, religious society is only civil society fully enlightened; the State in its highest perfection becomes the Church.²⁴

By "Church" Arnold meant the people who have a belief based on Jesus Christ.²⁵ Thus he would include the Dissenters, but exclude the Jews.

It is perhaps fitting that a reformer should be remembered for his reactions against trends as well as for them, and probably Arnold is best remembered, in the religious sphere, for the position he took

against the Oxford Movement. Arnold clearly demonstrates the spirit of the age in the fearlessness with which he published his views; and shows his reforming zeal by the fact that he stood virtually alone at first, but was later seen to have been correct.

The Oxford Movement, the members of which were also called the Tractarians, because of the Tracts of the Times that they published in the 1830's, was comprised of men who were at Oxford University, many of the more important in Oriel College, where Arnold had been a Fellow. The movement is said to have started when John Keble, a close friend of Arnold, preached a sermon on the National Apostasy, on July 14, 1833, condemning State interference in the affairs of the Church.²⁶ Other influential men agreed with the sentiments he expressed and combined to produce pamphlets and articles to air their views. The most dynamic of these men was John Henry Newman, who gave the group yet another name: the Newmanites. Newman became the acknowledged leader of the Tractarians, but they included men of the calibre of Pusey, Hurrell Froude, William Palmer and Arthur Perceval. These men were reacting against the popular move towards change and wanted to find salvation in the past. They "stood for the divine spirit of the Church of England as a direct continuous structure from the Apostolic age."²⁷

Arnold was the first person of any stature to see that the Oxford Movement could lead only to Roman Catholicism. He also believed that the Tractarians were traitors.²⁸ Gradually other people swung round to Arnold's way of thinking, but when he first propounded his views he was a lone voice.

The incident which brought Arnold and the Tractarians into open conflict was the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the position of Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, an appointment that was nearly given to Arnold. The Tractarians feared Hampden would make changes in the University of which they would not approve. They therefore launched an attack on him that was undoubtedly unfair and unscrupulous. Arnold's sense of justice was inflamed and he wrote a scathing article in which he pointed to every unpleasant aspect of the campaign.

...the attack on Dr. Hampden bears upon it the character not of error, but of moral wickedness. When men break the charities and decencies of life to run down a good and pious individual--when they raise a cry against him which they know will arouse the worst passions, and be re-echoed by their baser followers with a violence to shame even themselves--when they appeal not to any legal and competent tribunal, but to the votes of an assembly where party spirit is notoriously virulent--when they garble the writings of their intended victim, wholly neglecting such as would palpably refute the charge, and so detaching the passages which they quote from the context, and keeping out of sight the writer's general object, as to produce an impression unfair and false...they labour as far as in them lies to ruin his character.²⁹

The Newmanites were, at this time, very popular and very powerful. It was a brave move to take a stand against them, and one that had little chance of immediate success. Although Arnold's article was published anonymously, as were most of the articles in the Edinburgh Review at the time, he must have known that the identity of the writer would soon be known and that once again he would be assailed by his many critics. In fact he made no attempt to remain anonymous.

As it was, his article almost cost him his position as headmaster of Rugby School. When it became common knowledge that the article was written by Arnold, the trustees demanded to know whether

this were true. Arnold refused to say one way or the other, maintaining, as he had always done, that his private life was something for which he was not answerable to the trustees. At a meeting of the governing body, the matter was discussed and put to the vote. Under the terms of Arnold's contract a vote against him could only mean dismissal. There were eight votes cast: four for and four against. There was no casting vote and therefore Arnold retained his position. He was not so fortunate in other circles, however, for his writing cost him the Bishopric he wanted.³⁰

Arnold's views on religion caused him to resign from the Senate of the London University. In 1835 he accepted the post of Examiner in Arts at the new London University. As he tells his friend Hawkins, in a letter dated November 4, 1835:

I have accepted the office of one of the examiners in Arts. . . . I hold myself bound to influence so far as I may be able the working of a great experiment, which will probably in the end affect the whole education of the country. --I hold myself bound to prevent so far as in me lies the establishment of more sectarian places of education, which will be the case if you have regular colleges of Dissenters--and yet Dissenters must and ought to have degrees, and you shut them out from Oxford and Cambridge. . . . the Established Church is only the religion of a part of the nation, and there is the whole difficulty.³¹

As usual Arnold and his views were in a minority. He made strenuous efforts to make the new university a great institution of national education which should be Christian yet not sectarian, and to include a Scriptural examination which would be non-Sectarian in the classical examination for every degree. He was initially successful in having such an examination agreed upon, "as a general rule," but the success was short-lived and the motion later over-ruled and a voluntary

examination put in its place. In his usual earnest and forceful way Arnold pressed for his ideas to be adopted, but eventually he resigned, in November of 1838. The university quickly acquired the reputation of being a "godless" place and Arnold was criticised, unfairly considering his stand, for associating with it. He was also censured for neglecting his duties at Rugby by being absent in order to attend meetings at the university. Had Arnold's ideas been adopted, the new university would have debarred Jews, atheists and, in fact, any non-Christians, which Arnold felt to be only right and proper.

...the whole good that the University can do towards the cause of general education depends on its holding manifestly a Christian character; ... Now are we really for the sake of a few Jews, who may like to have a Degree in Arts, --or for the sake of one or two Mahomedans, who may possibly have the same wish, --or for the sake of English unbelievers, who dare not openly avow themselves, --are we to destroy our only chance of our being even either useful or respected as an Institution of national education?³²

Thus it was that Arnold's efforts ended in almost complete failure³³ and his resignation was the only step he could take. Arnold is again displaying contemporary attitudes here: liberalism in his desire to allow dissenters in to the universities; conservatism in that he was not prepared to allow non-Christians the same privileges; and even sectarianism in a broader form than usual. That is to say he had much the same attitude to Christianity as the sects within Christianity did to their own group.

Like a large number of the early Victorians Arnold had many interests, not the least of which was his concern for the poor. His urge to help was so great that he published a newspaper for a short time because he earnestly desired "...to speak to the people the words

of truth and soberness--to tell them plainly the evils that exist, and lead them, if I can, to their causes and their remedies."³⁴ The newspaper, called the Englishman's Register and published in 1831, lasted only a few weeks, partly because of the costs and partly because he did not have the time to control it properly.³⁵ The Sheffield Courant reprinted excerpts from the Register and after it became defunct he wrote some articles for the Courant. In one such article he says:

A man sets up a factory and wants 'hands,' I beseech you, Sir, to observe the very expressions that are used, for they are all significant. What he wants of his fellow creatures is the loan of their hands--of their heads and hearts he thinks nothing. These hands are attached to certain mouths and bodies which must be fed and lodged; but this must be done as cheaply as possible; and accordingly up starts a miserable row of houses, built where ground is cheapest, that is, where it is least generally desirable to get it; built as close as possible, to have the more of them on a given space, and for the same reason without any sort of garden or outlets attached to them, because the comfort and enjoyment of the human being is quite independent of the serviceableness of his hands. But further, Sir, these hands are not only attached to mouths and bodies, but to reasonable minds and immortal souls. The mouths and bodies must be provided for, however miserably, because without them the hands cannot work; but the minds and souls go utterly unregarded. And is this any other but a national crime, a crime in the civil government, a crime in the church, a crime in all the wealthy and intelligent part of the English people, that while hands have been multiplying so enormously during the last forty years in every corner of the kingdom, no greater efforts have been made to provide for the welfare of the humanbeings who have multiplied with them; being born not for time only but for eternity?³⁶

Arnold's words are typical of the writings of the times and, indeed, have a Dickensian quality to them.

The general trend in social matters was for societies and the government to take more responsibility upon themselves. Arnold's views on the social problems of the day were, as his writings show, basically paternalistic. He spent a great deal of his time trying to

ameliorate the conditions of the poor, both at Laleham and Rugby.³⁷
 He not only visited the sick, but also encouraged his boys to do so.³⁸
 At Rugby and Lutterworth he gave lectures to the Mechanics' Institutes and also gave sermons to village congregations. He established a dispensary in Rugby and, at the appearance of cholera, he issued tracts of advice on coping with the disease. In his letters to the Sheffield Courant he spoke out on many topics, including labour, wages, poverty, education and general reform. Earnestly he warned the labouring classes that they must not expect overnight miracles as he wrote sympathetically of their needs and aspirations. Parliamentary reform, he said, was no panacea for their ills, in fact there was no nostrum or political arrangement which could save them from their responsibility to work and to use their own efforts to improve their lot.³⁹ Industrialism was a fact of life, and a beneficial one from Arnold's point of view, as for many men of the age, but he did not lose sight of the social problems that it incurred.

A major problem of the time was the fear of revolt, and here Arnold was in complete accord with the middle-classes. Chartism and the Trades Unions he saw as potential revolutionary movements:

...the Trades' Unions are a fearful engine of mischief, ready to riot or to assassinate, with all the wickedness that has in all ages and in all countries characterized associations not recognised by the law,⁴⁰

For Arnold, change should come from within the society, whereas these organisations, he thought, were illegal and therefore outside society. Arnold, like many of his contemporaries, welcomed the fact that the early nineteenth century was a period of expanding industrialism.

He saw the new commercial age as the demise of feudalism and he rejoiced. In the spirit of the times he saw change as progress:

Those unsightly chimneys, and that disfiguring smoke, are a most wholesome balance to the palace, and the gardens, and the woods of Wentworth. Were it not for them, England would be no better than Russia or Poland, --we should be the mere serfs of a territorial aristocracy.⁴¹

Nevertheless Arnold had a considerable respect for the aristocracy, as he says in a letter to Platt, written in 1837:

...when an aristocracy is not thoroughly corrupted, its strength is incalculable; and it acts through the relations of private life, which are permanent, whereas the political excitement, which opposes it, must always be short-lived.⁴²

In his belief in the aristocracy Arnold is expressing another of the values of the time, as he is by clinging to the permanency suggested. The Victorians thought of themselves as living in a period of change and there was a tendency to march boldly forward, and yet try to retain something of the past.⁴³

The railways were a major symptom of the changes that were occurring in society and Arnold, again in keeping with the times, welcomed them. In speaking of the Manchester to Birmingham line he says that the ninety-five miles was covered in five hours, and that "nothing can be more delightful, as well as more convenient."⁴⁴ Rugby became a railway centre and Arnold's work in having the direction of the line changed⁴⁵ and in delivering sermons to the workers was well received in the town.⁴⁶

Arnold's desire to reform pervaded his whole life and was not restricted to his immediate surroundings. He felt that people should emigrate to the colonies in order to introduce a good strain in those places where so much evil existed. He considered emigrating himself

on several occasions and might well have done so had a suitable opportunity presented itself.⁴⁷ As early as 1815 he wrote an essay, which won the Chancellor's Essay Prize at Oxford, entitled "The Effects of Distant Colonization on the Parent State." He was responsible for at least one of his old pupils emigrating. In 1839 when asked to recommend someone to become headmaster of "a great school in Van Diemen's Land,"⁴⁸ he recommended J. P. Gell for the position, and his recommendation was accepted.

Politically, Arnold has been described as a Radical, and indeed an extreme Radical.⁴⁹ His relations with the Rugby Tory gentry were not of the best and the one local man with whom he was in sympathy was William Wratislaw, a solicitor and a Radical. In the general elections Arnold voted Liberal, but when a Radical candidate stood in 1835 Arnold voted for him. The strength of his convictions drove him to travel from Westmoreland specifically to cast his vote:

I was much annoyed at being called away into Warwickshire to vote at the election, --a long and hurried and expensive journey, with no very great interest in the contest, only as having a vote, I thought it right to go, and deliver my testimony.⁵⁰

The fact that he had "no very great interest in the contest" sounds strange when he went to such pains to vote. In the event he might have saved himself the annoyance, as the local Tories argued that he was not entitled to vote, not being a property owner and his vote was discounted.⁵¹ In his determination to use his vote, and even in his radicalism, Arnold was representative of many of the intellectual middle-class.

It is difficult to assess the extent of Arnold's radicalism but it is certain that he was anti-Tory: "...for the common Church and King

Tories, I would never go one hair's breadth to please them,"⁵² he remarks in a letter to his sister Susanna in April, 1831. In the following month he notes in a letter to Hull that "... all the Tories turn from me as a Liberal, whilst the strong Reformers think me timid and half corrupt, because I will not go along with them nor turn the Register into a new 'Examiner' or 'Ballot.' "⁵³

The Reform Bill of 1832 was an occasion for celebration as far as Arnold was concerned:

We are going to have a dinner here for all the town on passing the Reform Bill:--the thing was to be, and I have been labouring to alter its name, and to divest it of every thing political in order that every body might join in it; but of all difficult offices, that of a peacemaker seems to me to be one of the hardest.⁵⁴

His efforts at peacemaking were not rewarded. The local Tories were upset; not only did they see no cause for celebration in the passing of the Bill, but they felt that Arnold, as headmaster of the school, should be non-political.⁵⁵ This event was the first incident in which he aroused sufficient antagonism for anyone to write a letter to the local press. It was not to be the last. His only previous excursion into local affairs had been in the preceding year when he was, apparently, instrumental in having the railway re-routed to the north of the town instead of past the school. Here, however, his intervention met with approval.⁵⁶

His Radical views had caused local concern in 1830, however. This was the year of the second French Revolution and Arnold and his wife gave four pounds for the people who were suffering in Paris.⁵⁷ It was also said that he had a tricoloured cockade and his wife a similarly patterned work-bag.⁵⁸ Whether this report were true or not, the fact

is that he thought the Revolution to have been admirable:

But I do admire the Revolution in France--admire it as heartily and entirely, as any event recorded in history; ... the conduct of France has been beyond all example pure and heroic,⁵⁹

It is not difficult to see how he acquired the reputation of being Radical when he expresses views of this nature.

Reports that the headmaster of Rugby school was a revolutionary were guaranteed to make parents uneasy and that could quickly change the prosperity of the school. Apparently his connections with the Revolution had repercussions, because in November 1830, he notes, in a letter to Coleridge:

... I know that there are reports in Oxford of my teaching the boys my politics, and setting revolutionary themes. If you hear these reports, will you contradict them flatly? I never disguise or suppress my opinions, but I have been and am most religiously careful not to influence my boys with them;⁶⁰

This was not the only occasion he speaks of such reports.⁶¹ There is scant evidence to cause disbelief in Arnold's assertion that he did not deliberately influence his boys with his views. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that at least some of the boys were conversant with his opinions and had read his works, even if they had not discussed them with him.

His political and religious views caused Arnold to be attacked from almost every quarter during the middle thirties. The opposition to him began in theological and political circles, but soon included every topic, personal or professional, with which it was possible for people to find fault. The Northampton Herald contained almost weekly attacks on him; the Old Rugbeians who had been at the school under Wooll were also anxious to join the barrage against the new headmaster;

he was denounced at Oxford; and every aspect of the school came in for criticism, so that incidents which would normally have gone unnoticed were exaggerated beyond measure. "Even his personal acquaintance (sic) began to look upon him with alarm, some dropped their intercourse with him altogether, hardly any were able fully to sympathize with him, and almost all remonstrated."⁶² Arnold refused to answer the charges made against him:

My resolution is fixed to let them alone, and on no account to condescend to answer them in the newspapers. All that is wanted is to inspire firmness into the minds of those engaged in the conduct of the school, lest their own confidence should be impaired by a succession of attacks, which I suppose is unparalleled in the experience of schools.⁶³

With all this, his pupils at Rugby at this time are said to "have been willing to die for his sake."⁶⁴

It is, almost by definition, necessary for a reformer to be not only of his times, but slightly ahead of his times. If he is riding the tide of popular opinion then it becomes more difficult to see him as a reformer. If he is too far ahead of current thinking then his ideas will not be translated into positive action. In the middle period of his life at Rugby, Arnold was a lone figure. By the time that Queen Adelaide visited the school in October 1839, he was in the ascendant. By the time he died, in June 1842, he had outlived most, if not all, of the ill-feeling he had earlier aroused. His popularity continued to rise after his death, helped considerably by the publication in 1844 of Stanley's biography, one of the best works of its kind ever written, and certainly one of the most influential.⁶⁵ The fact that the book went to several editions the first year it was published shows that

contemporary opinion was catching up to Arnold. By 1857 he was known in America as a great man, a reformer and an exceptional teacher, as well as an advocate of games.⁶⁶

At first sight Arnold's life history seems so ordinary that it is difficult to understand either how he became the man that he was, or how he came to be so influential. It is, in fact, the very ordinari-ness of his life and even of his professional position that has made him so influential. To the twentieth century critic Arnold seems extraordinary in a number of ways. His moral earnestness, his capacity for work, his belief in the beneficence of change, and most of all his religious fervour mark him as an outstanding man. To the Victorians, however, almost every trait that Arnold displayed was one that was common. Arnold's strength lay in that he possessed the accepted virtues to an exceptional level, and displayed them in words and deeds. People could empathise with him in a way which is impossible for most people today.

The story of his life is unremarkable and can be told in a few sentences. He was born in 1795 on the Isle of Wight. In 1803 he was sent to Warminster as a boarder at Lord Weymouth's Grammar School. Four years later he went to Winchester College, and then in 1811 he was elected as a scholar at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1814 he took a First Class Degree in Litterae Humaniores and was elected to a Fellowship at Oriel College the following year. In 1818 he was ordained as a deacon into the Church of England. In August of the following year he opened a private, preparatory school with his brother-in-law. He was married in 1820 and remained at the school until 1828.

From then he was the headmaster of Rugby School until his death in 1842. In all, his life was not much different from many other early Victorian, middle-class men.

A closer examination of his life shows that in almost every way his most remarkable feature was simply that of exemplifying Victorian ideals to a marked degree. His life was a constant struggle to achieve financial security and acquire property. In both these aims he was successful. He succeeded in making the position of schoolmaster a respected one,⁶⁷ and the search for social respectability was a major factor in Victorian life.⁶⁸ He came from a large family and had nine children himself. He was an exemplar of the paternalistic Victorian patriarch:

Stern though his look could be--and often had to be--there was a vein of drollery in him, a spirit of pure fun, which perhaps came from his Suffolk ancestry. He was not witty, nor--though he could appreciate humour--was he humourous; but the comic and grotesque side of human life attracted him strongly... . In a sense we were afraid of him; that is, we were very much afraid, if we did wrong, of being found out and punished, and still worse, of witnessing the frown gather on his brow. Yet in all of us on the whole love cast out fear; for he never held us at a distance, was never impatient with us, always, we knew, was trying to make us good and happy.⁶⁹

This was the way in which his son, also named Thomas, remembered him, but the man pictured there had been formed by his experiences from childhood.

Thomas Arnold, the seventh child and youngest son of William and Martha Arnold was born on June 13, 1795, at West Cowes on the Isle of Wight.⁷⁰ His early education was undertaken by his aunt, Miss Delafield, although his father did much to encourage the boy's love of history and geography. These two interests were greatly stimulated

because he lived so close to the bustle of Cowes harbour, where ships of many nations were always coming and going. In later years he was to bemoan the fact that his Rugby pupils had not had the same opportunity.

Thomas was a precocious child. When he was only three years old he was given a well-bound copy of Smollet's History of England as a reward for his aptitude in history.⁷¹ Strangers tended to find the boy unnaturally shy and unfriendly, an unfortunate impression which, mutatis mutandis, stayed with him throughout his life. Apart from being precocious Thomas does not seem to have been much different from most small boys. He loved to play around the twenty-five acres of land on which the house was built, re-enacting famous land and sea battles, the former often of Ancient Greece and the latter those of the British fleet over the French. Armed with spear and shield he would play at being a Trojan, or, crouched over the pond with his toy boats would fancy himself a modern admiral. His later interests were thus early showing themselves.

In 1803 Thomas was sent to Warminster as a boarder at Lord Weymouth's Grammar School. His life there appears to have been exceptional only in the fact that the school had a good library where Arnold spent many hours reading, learning and storing information away in his superbly retentive memory. His religious feelings were deepened and strengthened by his reading, to the extent that before he was eleven years of age he had already stated his determination to be a clergyman. By the time that he was twelve, he was already applying the lessons of the ancient world to the one in which he lived, a habit

he retained all his life. He enjoyed the recreational aspects of school life, particularly bathing in the river, which proved to be another life-long custom. He played "a crude form of cricket," and some fives. He also found that he now had many more companions who would join him in mimic battles, so the siege of Troy and similar classical encounters were now re-fought in the school yard. More sedate pastimes that the young Arnold enjoyed were draughts, casino and the dancing classes.⁷² The only activity he appears to have disliked was the weekly organised walk.

Unfortunately the young Arnold's scholastic achievements were making him so bumptious and unpleasant that it seemed obvious that Warminster was no longer big enough for him. Consequently he was sent to Winchester College. Life at this Public School was hard and brutal, as it was in all such schools of the period. On Arnold's first night at the College he knelt down to say his prayers by the side of the bed and was assailed by a barrage of boots. This treatment was comparatively mild. Some of the customs were horrifying. Young boys had their hands burned with red-hot pokers; wooden platters were broken over their heads; their backs were lashed with ash rods; they were tossed in blankets and allowed to fall onto the floor, and were locked in chests or roasted in front of the fire. The treatment by the masters was little better.⁷³

School life was hard in ways other than the bullying and brutality. The pupils had to be out of bed by 5.30 a.m. and in chapel by six. Early rising was something Arnold found particularly difficult and he never overcame his inability to leave his bed with alacrity.

The academic work was far from easy. Arnold had to write as many as sixty sentences of Greek exercises, giving the themes, the declensions and the conjugations of each word, and to follow that by reciting ten pages of Greek grammar. Despite long hours in the schoolroom the boys often found it necessary to work late at night and to start early in the morning. Arnold is recorded as having risen at three o'clock on six successive mornings in order to prepare for a recitation of 3,000 lines of Homer.⁷⁴ His life at this time was, in fact, similar to that of all the other middle and upper class boys who went to boarding-school.

Arnold survived the life and, despite the cruelties, the fagging⁷⁵ and the thrashings that were a daily feature, obviously looked back upon his time at Winchester with something approaching affection.⁷⁶ No doubt some of his pleasure was derived from the fact that he liked work; he found it invigorating. By 1809 he was in a position to compare the Greek and Roman historians, much to the disadvantage of the latter;⁷⁷ he discussed and argued the merits of the French Revolution, taking the view that all things must be measured in their relation to the good of the people. This radical strain lasted throughout his life, and his sympathies with the French Revolutionists were to cause him considerable trouble when he was headmaster of Rugby.⁷⁸

Not only was he interested in the ancient world and in foreign affairs, but his insight into contemporary English life was remarkable in one so young. He was shocked by the condition of the Church and found the lack of morals displayed by the Royal Princes and the intrigues in Parliamentary life equally distasteful. His earlier determination to

become a parson was strengthened by this evidence of evil. Arnold the reformer was taking shape.⁷⁹

His religious ardour, his love of work and the difficulty he had in dealing with strangers, combined to make him something of a prig. He was saved from this fate by character traits which were more normal in a young boy. He loved food, took a delight in new clothes, was invariably impecunious, and was willing to break rules that he thought unreasonable. Most of all he had a passion for exercise which lasted throughout his life. There is no sign of the prig in the picture of him bathing in, or boating on, the river, or wading into mid-stream with his companions in an attempt to see whose straw hat would sink first, or indulging in "skirmishing" as he called his cross-country walks. He entered fully into the usual pastimes of the boys, as his letters show, spending time bird-slinging, pole-jumping, tree-climbing, animal tracking, mountaineering in the chalk-pit, fighting, hunting badgers and similar pursuits, as well as playing football and cricket.⁸⁰ Equally, the fact that he participated in the ragging which was a feature of school life, and which involved beds being wrecked, windows broken, doors battered and water thrown, helps to make him appear as a normal boy of the times.⁸¹

In 1811, at the tender age of fifteen,⁸² he went to Oxford, to Corpus Christi College.⁸³ Oxford was a complete joy to Arnold. The College, the countryside, his companions, the work, everything about the place suited him, and in some ways he was probably happier during this period than any other. Boys tended to go up⁸⁴ to university at an earlier age than nowadays, but, even so Arnold, at fifteen, was younger

than most. The new freedom he found might have led a less mature boy of that age to great excesses, but Arnold was capable of coping with the responsibility.

Many a boy has found the social life of university, coupled with the lack of direction, to be too great an attraction, and work has suffered accordingly. Arnold, despite his youth, quickly settled down to hard work. His family, he knew, was in no position to support him after his college career was over, and a good degree was going to be essential. However, even without this knowledge, it is certain that he would have worked hard, not only because he enjoyed it, but because he was a congenital worker. Not to work would have been unthinkable. Even his leisure activities have the air of being, in large part, measures to prepare him for the next bout of work. Already he was showing signs of those traits which were to make him both a great headmaster and a man to whom the later Victorians would look for guidance.

The universities at this time were just beginning to revive from a century or more of torpor, malpractice and intellectual decadence. Luckily for Arnold, Corpus Christi was one of the colleges that were leading the way in the revival of learning and intellectual endeavour. It was also a small college⁸⁵ which undoubtedly was an advantage for Arnold, who quickly found himself exchanging opinions with other young men whose intellects were as good as or superior to his own, whose ideas were as firmly fixed, and often better based, and who had the advantage over him of an extra year or two.

He was a mere boy in appearance as well as in age; but we saw in a very short time that he was quite equal to take his part in the arguments of the common room; . . . As he was equal, so was he ready to take part in our discussion: he was fond of conversation on serious matters, and vehement in argument; fearless too in advancing his opinions--which, to say the truth, often startled us a good deal; but he was ingenuous and candid, and though the fearlessness with which, so young as he was, he advanced his opinions might have seemed to betoken presumption, yet the good temper with which he bore retort or rebuke, relieved him from that imputation; he was bold and warm, because so far as his knowledge went he saw very clearly, and he was an ardent lover of truth, but I never saw in him even then a grain of vanity or conceit.⁸⁶

His new companions were, for the most part Tories, and Arnold had already developed a strong radical streak. He often found himself alone against the rest defending his opinions and attacking theirs. While these debates never turned him into a Tory, they certainly modified his radicalism.

We did not always convince him--perhaps we ought not always to have done so--yet in the end a considerable modification of his opinions was produced: in one of his letters to me, written at a much later period, he mentions this change.⁸⁷

Among the friends he made at this time, some were to be friends for life, men like John Keble, Augustus Hare, John Tucker and George Cornish, as well as Coleridge, while others, such as Trevenen Penrose and John Buckland were to become related to him by marriage.⁸⁸

During his undergraduate career Arnold showed a marked preference for the ancient philosophers and historians compared to the poets, which led him to undervalue the niceties of language. He did write verse, which was not exceptional, and he did appreciate other people's poetry, particularly that of Wordsworth and Coleridge.⁸⁹ His fondness for the Romantic poets was shared by many. His passion, however, was for Aristotle and Thucydides, a passion he retained to the end of his life.⁹⁰ His writing style, at this stage, was stilted and

stiff, but he was able to write narratives in the style of either Herodotus or Thucydides "with wonderful readiness."⁹¹

He retained his enjoyment of walking, bathing and skirmishing and was capable of feats of great endurance.⁹² He took an interest in geology and continued to have "the same passion for the seas and shipping, and his favourite Isle of Wight; the same love for external nature, the same readiness in viewing the characteristic features of a country" In all these respects he was to remain "remarkable in after life."⁹³ As for his career as an Oxford undergraduate, he was

at the commencement a boy--and at the close retaining, not ungracefully, much of boyish spirits, frolic, and simplicity; in mind vigorous, active, clear-sighted, industrious, and daily accumulating and assimilating treasures of knowledge; not averse to poetry, but delighting rather in dialectics, philosophy, and history, with less of imaginative than reasoning power; in argument bold almost to presumption, and vehement; in temper easily roused to indignation, yet more easily appeased and entirely free from bitterness; fired indeed, by what he deemed ungenerous or unjust to others, rather than by any sense of personal wrong; somewhat too little deferential to authority; yet without any real inconsistency loving what was good and great in antiquity the more ardently and reverently because it was ancient; a casual or unkind observer might have pronounced him somewhat too pugnacious in conversation and too positive . . . scarcely any thing would have pained him more than to be convinced that he had been guilty of want of modesty, or of deference where it was justly due; no one thought these virtues of more sacred obligation. In heart, if I can speak with confidence of any of the friends of my youth, I can of his, that it was devout (sic) and pure, simple, sincere, affectionate and faithful.⁹⁴

The description would have fitted many a young Oxford student.

His undergraduate life finished on 30th April 1814, when he was able to write home: "I have done with lectures and so on for ever. Henceforth I shall be the Director of my own studies and shall have it in my power to turn my attention entirely to those subjects to which my

inclinations naturally lead me." ⁹⁵ In fact he was to study theology. Three weeks before his nineteenth birthday he learned that he had obtained a first-class degree. In triumph he set out to celebrate by a walking tour of the beautiful Wye valley, ⁹⁶ which satisfied both his love of history and of energetic exercise.

During his stay at Oxford, Arnold continued to participate in vigorous physical activities, but there is no evidence that he played either cricket or football at this period. He walked, bathed, went on skirmishes and often rowed. In a letter to his aunt, Susan Delafield, dated March, 1811, he reports:

I go frequently on the River, and am very well known already by all the Boatmen; indeed Matt (his elder brother) was so much a Sailor that they do not wonder to see me equally fond of it; the only Difference is that he used to prefer sailing, & I rowing, for I think sailing in the River Thames is a Farce, and like sailing on a Duck Pond. My Amusement is to go in a light Skiff on Voyage of Discovery up the Charwell and every little Stream I can find; sometimes, as to Day for Instance, I row two or three miles down the Isis and back again. ⁹⁷

Despite his enthusiasm for rowing, it was skirmishing that his friends remembered best, and which seemed to leave the strongest impression on him. He often referred to the skirmishes he had taken with his companions many years after they had left Oxford. For instance, in 1821 he wrote to Cornish, "...I would give large Money for a Skirmish some Day or other, even though you should go as near to break my Head, as you did once between Foresthill & Heddington." ⁹⁸ Cornish must have been one of his favourite companions on these jaunts, for as late as 1837, Arnold mentions an incident of their Oxford days in a letter to him, and in 1832 he says:

I thought of you and of Bagley Wood, and old times, when I walked with Grenfell the other day in the rain to a wood about four miles from here, dug up orchis roots, and then bathed on our way home, hanging our clothes on a stick under a tree, to save them from being wet in the interval. . . .⁹⁹

Sometimes Arnold walked in order to reach a destination rather than for the fun of skirmishing. On one occasion he completed eighteen miles in three minutes over four hours.¹⁰⁰ At Oxford as at Winchester, Arnold played hard and worked hard, which was a pattern he kept throughout his life. His major physical activities were Barbarian in character and he enjoyed the freedom of these pursuits, as well as the vigorousness of the exercise.

His graduation did not mark the end of Arnold's life at Oxford. He sat for one of two vacancies for Fellows at Oriel College. On the recommendation of one man, Richard Whately, an Oriel tutor, Arnold was elected, despite being very young and handing in papers that were of a lower quality than other candidates. Whately's opinion, which was highly respected, was that Arnold showed more promise than the others. The new Fellow quickly justified Whately's confidence. In the same year as his election he won the Chancellor's prize for English Essays. Two years later he won the Chancellor's Latin Essay Prize.¹⁰¹

Arnold's Fellowship, although it gave him the opportunity to work with some of the most scholarly men in Oxford, did not help his financial position to any great extent. His family were in no position to help him. His father had died when he was six years old; his sister, Susanna, had been struck down by an illness which was to leave her bed-ridden for twenty years, and one of his older brothers, William, had died in Tobago. Arnold, therefore, became a tutor and started on

his career as a teacher at the age of twenty. It was force of circumstances rather than any feeling of vocation that caused him to turn to teaching.

After being ordained as a deacon, Arnold decided to become a full-time schoolmaster, in partnership with John Buckland who was already a successful teacher and was anxious to try a new idea. He wanted to found a preparatory school, where boys would be made ready for entrance into university or into one of the Public Schools. Buckland wanted him to have charge of the older boys while he took the younger. Arnold was firmly on the road to fame in the field of education. John Buckland, too, was to win a certain amount of renown, as the "Father of the English Preparatory School."¹⁰²

His life at Laleham is noteworthy for nothing so much as its peace, happiness and tranquility. Here Arnold had the chance to work out his educational ideas and, indeed, to formulate them, and to test them under almost experimental conditions. "In many respects his method at Laleham resembled the plan which he pursued on a larger scale at Rugby."¹⁰³ He soon became convinced of the necessity of expulsion, but also of leniency wherever and whenever possible.¹⁰⁴ Bonamy Price, one of Arnold's assistant masters at Rugby, was a pupil at Laleham for a very short period. Of this experience he is recorded as saying:

The most remarkable thing which struck me at once on joining the Laleham circle was, the wonderful healthiness of tone and feeling which prevailed in it. Every thing about me I immediately found to be most real; it was a place where a newcomer at once felt that a great and earnest work was going forward. Dr. Arnold's great power as a private tutor resided in this, that he gave such an intense earnestness to life. Every pupil was made to feel that there

was a work for him to do--that his happiness as well as his duty lay in doing that work well. . . . pupils of the most different natures were keenly stimulated; none felt that he was left out, or that, because he was not endowed with large powers of mind, there was no sphere open to him in the honourable pursuit of usefulness. This wonderful power of making all his pupils respect themselves, and of awakening in them a consciousness of the duties that God had assigned to them personally, and of the consequent reward each should have of his labours, was one of Arnold's most characteristic features as a trainer of youth; he possessed it eminently at Rugby; but, if I may trust my own vivid recollections, he had it quite as remarkably at Laleham.¹⁰⁵

Price stresses the hold that Arnold had over his pupils, a hold which enabled them to feel that they could perform their allotted task in the world. His religious character is also described by this old pupil who dwells on the pervasiveness of his religion. Some of the details of Arnold's life at this period, the amount of time he spent with his pupils and his work on Roman History are also mentioned, as are the recreations of master and pupils:

Who that ever had the happiness of being at Laleham, does not remember the lightness and joyousness of heart, with which he (Arnold) would romp and play in the garden, or plunge with a boy's delight into the Thames; or the merry fun with which he would battle with spears with his pupils? Which of them does not recollect how the Tutor entered into his amusements with scarcely less glee than himself?¹⁰⁶

It is obvious that Arnold's greater responsibilities had not prevented him from finding time to participate in his favorite recreations.

Life at Laleham had most of the ingredients that were typical of the Victorian home. Arnold's unceasing labour, his earnestness, his regard for the poor and his paternalism were clearly evident. He was with his pupils almost all day, for not only did he spend the school hours with them, but they had tea with him and were invited to stay afterwards. On February 22, 1824, he writes to his friend the Rev. John Tucker:

My pupils all come up into the drawing-room a little before tea, and stay for some time, some reading, others talking, playing chess or backgammon, looking at pictures, &c. --a great improvement if it lasts; and if this fair beginning continues, I care not a straw for the labour of the half year, for it is not labour but vexation which hurts a man, and I find my comfort depends more and more on their good and bad conduct. They are an awful charge, but still to me a very interesting one, and one which I could cheerfully pursue till my health or faculties fail me.¹⁰⁷

It is difficult to understand how Arnold, like so many of his contemporaries, managed to find any time for recreation. His correspondence alone was immense and then he was working on his *Lexicon of Thucydides* as well as an edition of that author with notes, a short *History of Greece* and articles on Roman History that he wrote for the *Encyclopedia Metropolitana*. He also found time to learn German so that he might read Niebuhr's *History of Rome*. Withal he did not divorce himself from current affairs, "I cannot tell you how the present state of the country occupies my mind, ..." he writes in 1826.¹⁰⁸ He also devoted time to the poor and the sick in the village, even to the point of giving up some of his exercise time in order to do so:

I wanted to see more of the poor people, and I found that, unless I devoted regular time to it, I should never do it, for the hunger for exercise on the part of myself and my horses, used to send me out riding as soon as my work was done; whereas now I give up Thursday to the village, and it will be my own fault if it does not do me more good than the exercise would.¹⁰⁹

Before he could do anything else he had his teaching to finish. He taught the boys not only the classics, but also divinity, geography, history, mathematics and algebra. Unlike most teachers of the time he tried to retain his pupils' interest by the use of diagrams and colourful pictures.¹¹⁰

Nevertheless, despite, or perhaps because of the pressure of work, he did find time to relax, taking his pupils walking, birds'-nesting, butterfly-catching, and to places where they cut slings and arrows out of the hedges. He erected a pole-jump and a gallows, which was similar to a modern high-bar, in the garden and spent entire afternoons with the boys there, engaged in "leaping and other gymnastic exercises."¹¹¹ He also swam and played games with them in the Thames, and rowed and sailed with them. He introduced his Laleham pupils to his favourite pastime of skirmishing and they even played games of Red Indians and engaged in mock battles, as he had done many years before at Winchester and Warminster.¹¹² Not only did he encourage his pupils to exercise, but he also persuaded his friends to join him in spearing.¹¹³

Despite his preference for these types of activity, Arnold was conversant enough with football to use it to provide a telling metaphor. A friend wrote to him in 1821 and asked his advice on the problems of dealing with an awkward pupil. Arnold replied that he should try to make an impression on the boy, rather than expel him, although this should be reserved as a last resort. He admits that such an impression is difficult to make:

It is very often like kicking a football up hill; you kick it onwards twenty yards, and it rolls back nineteen; still you have gained one yard, and thus in a good many kicks you make some progress.

If this approach does not work, Arnold continues,

... then I would advise you to send him off without delay; for then taking the mischief he will do to others into the account, the football rolls down twenty-five yards to your kick of twenty, and that is a losing game.¹¹⁴

Not only does this demonstrate Arnold's use of the metaphor, but it shows that even as early as 1821 he had formed some of the theories he was to apply at Rugby. Expulsion he already saw as a last resort, and as one to be used for the good of the community.

As the years at Laleham passed, Arnold found himself the father of a rapidly growing family, which posed a threat to his new-found financial stability. By 1827 he had had six children, five of whom survived.¹¹⁵ In the following year Mary presented him with yet another. Arnold had managed to pay off his debts by this time, but if he were to remain solvent he would have to increase his income. This practical consideration came at a time when Arnold was beginning to feel the need to do something more than he was; something more important. He could hardly fit anything extra into his already over-full schedule; the obvious answer was a new position. Life had become too comfortable, too easy for a man of Arnold's temperament. However much he added to his work load the fact was that he could cope; he was not stretched to the full; his growing abilities were not being fully tested. If he could do more, then his duty as a Christian demanded that he do so. One senses that it was for the greater glory of God, as well as for the needs of his family and his personal ambitions, that drove him to look for something new. He was aware of his own maturing powers and wanted, indeed needed to give them scope. His reforming zeal was coming to the fore. "I hope to be allowed, before I die, to accomplish something on Education, and also with regard to the Church, the last indeed even more than the other, were not the task, humanly speaking, so hopeless," he writes in 1826. "I fear the approach of a greater

struggle between good and evil than the world has yet seen," ¹¹⁶
 He had to be in the forefront of that conflict, and the quiet backwater of Laleham was not an adequate arena. It had become too much of a home. ¹¹⁷

This was the state of affairs when Dr. Wooll, headmaster of Rugby School sent in his resignation in 1827. Arnold was urged to apply, but the problem of the Thirty-nine Articles caused him to decline. ¹¹⁸ He also was not as convinced as were his friends that he was a fit person for the position. "I do think that I should have made a much worse master of Rugby after all than you give me credit for." ¹¹⁹ Hawkins and Whately had no such fears, nor had they Arnold's scruples about his signing the Articles. Eventually they persuaded him to apply, which he did on November 28th, 1827. However, there seemed little hope that he would be successful; not only was his application late but there was a strong field of candidates, several of whom were obviously better qualified than this master of a small private school. ¹²⁰ Nevertheless, as is now well-known, Arnold was elected and a major factor in his election was the famous sentence in Hawkins' letter predicting that, if elected, Arnold would change the face of education all through the public schools of England. ¹²¹ The situation is strikingly similar to that when Arnold was elected a Fellow of Oriel. Once again the words of one man had given him an election which, on the surface, he did not deserve.

Once the die was cast Arnold's doubts vanished and his outlook became much more positive. Here was his chance to try out on a large

scale the educational ideas he had been formulating at Laleham for nearly ten years. He refutes the idea, which seems to have been common, that he would "alter things violently or for the pleasure of altering" them, and is very conscious of the "solemn and almost overwhelming responsibility" that has been imposed on him. This responsibility was not confined to the instilling of knowledge into the boys. "To be sure, how small in comparison is the importance of my teaching the boys to read Greek, and how light would be a school-master's duty if that were all of it." Nevertheless, he was prepared: "Yet, if my health and strength continue as they have been for the last eight years, I do not fear the labour, and really enjoy the prospect of it."¹²²

In letters written to his friends while he was wavering and after he had applied, Arnold gives several statements of his ideas at this stage. "...I should very much object to undertake a charge in which I was not invested with pretty full discretion," he tells Hawkins in October of 1827, when writing to tell him he would not apply for the position. "According to my notions of what large schools are," he adds, "founded on all I know and all I have ever heard of them, expulsion should be practised much oftener than it is." He notes that the trustees of schools would not like this idea as it would lead to a decrease in numbers, but feels that it is indispensable as an ultimate weapon. "I do not believe myself, that my system would be, in fact, a cruel or harsh one, and I believe that with much care on the part of the masters, it would be seldom necessary to proceed to the ratio ultima."¹²³

Even at this stage it was his hopes of imparting a Christian education to the boys that concerned him. "If I do get it, (the Rugby Headmastership) I feel as if I could set to work very heartily, and, with God's blessing, I should like to try whether my notions of Christian education are really impracticable, . . ." he says in a letter to the Rev. George Cornish on November 30th, 1827, two days after his application had been sent. In the same letter he notes the "perfect vileness which I must daily contemplate,"¹²⁴ showing that he had no illusions as to the state he expected to find; doubtless his memories of Winchester were strongly with him at that time. His expectations, he tells the Rev. Tucker in a letter written on December 28th, 1827, are quite modest:

. . . whether I shall be able to make the school what I wish to make it, --I do not mean wholly or perfectly, but in some degree, -- that is, an instrument of God's glory, and of the everlasting good of those who come to it, --that indeed is an awful anxiety.¹²⁵

Three months later, in a letter to the Rev. Blackstone, he comments that his views of things "certainly become daily more reforming;"¹²⁶ All Arnold's views as he expressed them at this time, the responsibility of the post, the need for autonomy, the desire that the system should not be harsh, and most especially, his urge to reform and to make the education Christian and the school an instrument of God's glory, are typical both of what he tried to accomplish at Rugby, and of the spirit of the age.

One factor which was of considerable importance both to Arnold personally and to subsequent headmasters was his insistence that he be given a free hand in the running of the school. The freedom that

Arnold enjoyed provided a precedent for future headmasters, enabling the strong ones to build up their schools in a way that would have been impossible without this autonomy. The trustees, Arnold felt, should have the power to dismiss him, but not to interfere with him. Thus the controversies that raged around his head were both caused by Arnold and defended by Arnold. The trustees had no choice but to agree with the headmaster or to rid themselves of him. On at least one occasion they came extremely close to the latter course of action.¹²⁷

Arnold's wife, his family, the Sixth Form and probably many of the boys other than the Sixth Formers, as well as most, if not all, of the assistant masters¹²⁸ were appalled at the general lack of appreciation of a man whom they considered to be a good and great person and headmaster. The boys who had left Rugby and gone up to the universities were constantly singing his praises and attempting to convert people to their way of thinking.¹²⁹ The task was a difficult one, and it was not until about 1838 that there was any significant shift of opinion outside his immediate circle.

Within this circle, Arnold the patriarch can be seen quite clearly:

The families, the wives as well, were integrated into the scene, and every Sunday they would sit in the reserved pew in the Chapel, with Arnold greeting each one with a word and a handshake as they left. It was a well-knit community with a figurehead, where the official leader was the natural leader--a true social group in every sense of the word.¹³⁰

In his own family, the picture is more intimate, but essentially the same. He was a family man who obviously loved his family,

enjoyed their company, joined in their pastimes with great enthusiasm and, in fact, was often the leader in their games and jaunts.¹³¹ When the family went to Fox How, the country home that Arnold built in Westmoreland, he would waken the children at seven o'clock in the morning by running from bed to bed and giving the youngsters a friendly tap with a hair brush as he pulled the bed clothes off. Together, father and children bathed, played games and climbed the mountains or sailed and skated on the lakes.

Rydal Lake is frozen as hard as a rock, and my nine children, and I with them, were all over it to-day, to our great delight. Four of my boys skait. Walter is trundled in his wheelbarrow, and my daughters and I slide, for now I am afraid that I am too old to learn to skait now.¹³²

Some of the exploits of the children seem quite dangerous, for they not only walked up the slopes but actually went rock-climbing.¹³³ In their letters, the young Arnolds frequently mention their sports and obviously enjoyed having their father with them.¹³⁴

All was not fun and games, however. Arnold insisted that his children have school work even during the holidays and he was careful to draw up a list of rules, which he displayed in a prominent place, to govern the behaviour of the "dogs" as he called the children. The rules were sensible and fair, covering such subjects as the time for meals, supervision when going to the lake, the hours that were to be spent reading and similar topics.¹³⁵ Arnold the father, in fact, was much like Arnold the headmaster, warm and friendly to those who pleased him, stern and forbidding to those who did not.

Arnold was, by his own admission, an ambitious man, yet he never put his own interests before the more general ones that aroused

his interest.¹³⁶ Despite the fact that his writings caused him to lose the preferment that he sought, in particular a Bishop's mitre in 1836, he never considered remaining silent. His honesty compelled him to refuse the first offer he received of an appointment within the Church. In June of 1831 he was offered a stall in Bristol Cathedral which would have given him £600 per annum and would not have taken him away from his duties as headmaster. However, he had, since his appointment at Rugby, been doing everything within his power to raise the salaries of his assistant masters and to dissuade them from augmenting their incomes by accepting curacies and similar positions. He obviously could not, under the circumstances, accept such a post himself. Also in 1831 the Archbishop of Dublin died, and Arnold and Dr. Richard Whately were the two main contenders for the vacancy. It seems that Whately had the better intermediaries and was offered the post.¹³⁷

Arnold had misfortune in secular posts also. In 1840, at a time when his popularity was rising, he was offered the Wardenship of Manchester College, but he refused it on the grounds that it either had to be a sinecure, which would have been unthinkable to Arnold, or it would involve him in as much work, and that of an entirely new kind, as he already had. Undoubtedly the fact that the salary was small had a considerable part to play in his decision.¹³⁸ It may be that he was holding out in the hope of obtaining a chair at Oxford, which would have fulfilled his dearest wish. However, in September of 1840 he wrote to Chevalier Bunsen: "...I have now reason to know that I should never be appointed to one of those new Professorships in Oxford, which above

all things would have been acceptable to me. . . ." ¹³⁹ These new chairs were connected with religion, which was the area in which Arnold had achieved his fame and notoriety. It was this latter which prevented him from being offered a chair, as is shown by a letter written to the Bishop of Norwich, who had been petitioning on Arnold's behalf. Lord Melbourne replied to the Bishop saying:

I have, as you know, a high opinion of Dr. Arnold, which has been raised still higher by the affair of the Wardenship of Manchester, but Arnold has published some indiscreet opinions--I call them indiscreet because they have, as it appears to me, without any reason or object, impaired his own utility--and these opinions would, I own, render me unwilling to name him for a professorship of divinity, or any science connected with divinity, in the University of Oxford. ¹⁴⁰

1841 saw the downfall of the Liberal Government of Lord Melbourne and should, therefore, have spelled the ultimate end of Arnold's hopes of any form of elevation, for the incoming government, of Sir Robert Peel, was traditionalist and High Church. However, the Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford died, and Melbourne, only a week before his government fell, offered the chair to Arnold. ¹⁴¹ The offer was as much of a surprise to Arnold as it was to everyone else. His hopes of a Professorship had been restricted to Divinity, and his historical work, good as it was, had all been concerned with ancient, rather than modern civilisations. However, Arnold accepted the post with alacrity, although he decided to remain at Rugby and give a shorter series of lectures than was called for by the terms of the contract. He therefore forfeited his stipend for as long as he should remain at Rugby, asking that the moneys be put to some worthy university cause such as establishing a history scholarship. ¹⁴²

By the time that he accepted the Chair of Modern History, Arnold had passed through an extremely stormy period of his life and appeared to be emerging into an era of comparative tranquility and acceptance. His lectures at Oxford were outstandingly successful. He attracted hundreds of listeners where the norm was tens; applause and good-will met him on every side at his alma mater; people who came to listen to his lectures in the hope of hearing him attack the Newmanites, stayed to hear the lectures when they found that he did not intend to stir up more strife. He now knew that he would have some money throughout his life, although the Professorial stipend was not large; his nine children were growing up and giving him untold pleasure, and although he was still a man alone, there were signs that he was attracting followers. The school was in as good a state as he could expect, although not as good as he would have liked; but then, it never could be. There are signs that he was slowing down, however, and looking forward more eagerly and more often to the thought of retiring to his Lakeland home,¹⁴³ but he was happy and contented with the way things were moving. His mind appears to have been more preoccupied than usual with the thought of death and the impermanence of life, a thought heightened, perhaps, by the realisation that he was approaching the age at which his father had died.¹⁴⁴

Arnold's happiness at this time was enhanced by the fact that his daughter Jane was to be married to George Cotton, one of his assistant masters.¹⁴⁵ Then, in May, only a month before the wedding, Arnold broke the engagement off.¹⁴⁶ The emotional strain was such that Arnold contracted a fever and had to take to his bed. He apparently

recovered after a few days, but was still weak and not his usual self, and probably should have stayed in bed longer than he did. On June 11, 1842, he went walking before he retired. Early next morning he experienced severe pains in the chest. Three hours or so later, on the day before his forty-seventh birthday, he was dead of angina pectoris, the complaint that had killed his father. He was buried on the following Friday in the vault of Rugby School chapel.¹⁴⁷

This then was the man who has been credited with saving the Public Schools, a fierce, fervidly religious man whose moral integrity caused him to fight for what he believed to be right, whatever the consequences; a man who welcomed the new forces that were changing the face of England but who was deeply concerned with the consequences of those changes; a man whose views were thought to be radical but were later accepted; a man capable of arousing violent antagonisms and deep loves; a paternalistic man who loved and cared for his charges; a man who worked and played with equal concentration. He was a man who typified much of early Victorian England. He was a reformer. He was the headmaster who, it is said, reformed Rugby School and by his work there started the movement towards organised games which resulted in the athletic cult of the later nineteenth century.

There is nothing in Arnold's character, beliefs or experience to militate against a positive feeling towards games. The fact that games became so popular shows that they expressed a wide-felt need, and Arnold was too much a product of his times not to have experienced whatever societal pressures were at work to create this need. His life pattern shows that he enjoyed and needed energetic physical activity.

Certainly he encouraged his family, his friends and his Laleham pupils to participate in strenuous pastimes. As will be seen, he also encouraged his Rugby pupils in the same way.

Equally it is not incompatible with Arnold's beliefs for games to be organised. His own pastimes were not of the organised games' type, but he did believe in rules, as is shown by those he used for his children at Fox How. His life style must have been quite strictly regulated for him to complete the amount of work that he did. In fact his correspondence shows that his day was well organised. His paternalistic instincts would undoubtedly have approved of a situation in which boys could be watched at their play, something which was not possible if they were fishing, or hunting.

An examination of Arnold's life and beliefs suggests that he might well have approved of organised games. It is even more certain that he would never have approved of the compulsion that characterised games in the later nineteenth century. There is no suggestion in his life that he ever compelled boys to participate in any form of physical activity, despite his belief in the need for it. The only time he was subjected to compulsion was as a schoolboy when he was forced to take a communal walk, and he hated it. Most of all, there is no doubt that he would never have condoned the semi-religious overtones that games acquired. He thought that everything one did should be done in a religious way, but it had to be for the further glory of Christ. He would probably have seen the games of the 1880's and 1890's as being idolatrous.

NOTES

¹ Norman Wymer, Dr. Arnold of Rugby (London: Robert Hales, Ltd., 1953), p. 36. The letter is quoted but no further details are given.

The basic text for Arnold's life and beliefs is A. P. Stanley, The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D. (London: B. Fellowes, 1844) in two volumes. This biography has over three hundred of Arnold's letters in it, which makes it invaluable.

There are a number of other biographies and commentaries, but the two best to supplement Stanley's work are Wymer, op. cit., who had access to materials which had not been published earlier and is therefore able to give more detail on Arnold's personal life, and T. W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London: The Cresset Press, 1960), who has also given much previously unpublished material, most of which shows the controversies and less successful parts of Arnold's life. It forms a good counterbalance to Wymer and Stanley.

Letters and documents at a number of centres have also been utilised in preparing this chapter. Where these data are referred to they are designated as follows: Rugby MS - those papers which are presently kept at Rugby School; Bodleian MS - those papers which are currently at Bodley's Library, Oxford; British Museum MS. - papers at the British Museum; other sources, such as Leeds University Library, have been examined, but none of the materials have been cited in this chapter.

² Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 50.

See also ibid., p. 110, where Stanley quotes Arnold as saying, "Another system may be better in itself, but I am placed in this system, and am bound to try what I can make of it."

³ The Utilitarians were the followers of Jeremey Bentham, and therefore believed in the ethical theory which finds the basis of moral distinctions in the utility of men's actions, i. e., whether the actions produce more or less happiness for the greater number. Arnold could never agree with their atheistic tendencies, although in other ways he and Bentham had much in common.

⁴ Arnold suggested that, as a first step towards reincorporating the dissenters within the Church, the churches should be opened to them, so that their own ministers could conduct services there. See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 63.

Interestingly Cotton, when he was Bishop of Calcutta, did adopt this very step, although it met with disapproval from some quarters. See G. G. Bradley, "The Late Bishop of Calcutta," Macmillan's Magazine, (December, 1866), p. 109.

In a letter to The Times, August 25, 1888, Dean Lake notes that an increasing number of churches were opened, as Arnold had suggested nearly fifty years before.

⁵The Times, January 25 and 26, 1833.

⁶Bamford, op. cit., p. 67.

The pamphlet, "Principles of Church Reform" is reprinted in Thomas Arnold (A. P. Stanley, ed.), The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D. D. (London: B. Fellowes, 1844), pp. 257-338.

⁷Ibid., p. 321.

⁸The Times, January 25, 1833.

⁹Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 341, letter to the Archbishop of Dublin, dated Rydal, January 17, 1833. Letter No: LV.

¹⁰Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 219-20. This is part of a letter he wrote to the Sheffield Courant ca. 1831/2.

See also E. L. Williamson Jr., The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1964), p. 126.

¹¹Preface to the pamphlet "Principles of Church Reform." Reprinted in Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., p. 259.

See also Williamson, op. cit., p. 127.

¹²Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 65-7.

Bamford notes that some of his enemies saw Arnold's attempts at Church reform as a neat device to have himself translated. If there were to be more bishoprics, then there would have to be more bishops, and people thought that Arnold's motives in suggesting more bishops were to have himself included among that number.

Arnold's pamphlet, "Principles of Church Reform" received attention for three consecutive days in The Times, January 24, 25, and 26, 1833, and the comments were surprisingly favourable, but it was felt that his proposals were not in harmony with any established group and would, therefore, meet with little success.

Much of the pamphlet and other of Arnold's writings on this theme are obviously an expansion of the ideas of S. T. Coleridge, notably such concepts as retaining part of the national wealth for public purposes and the advantages in having a Christian scholar and gentleman in every parish of the land to do as much good as he could, and whose sole duty was simply that.

¹³ See David Newsome, The Parting of Friends (London: John Murray, 1966), p. 164.

¹⁴ Basil Willey, Nineteenth Century Studies (London: Chatto and Windus, 1964), p. 63. See also ibid., pp. 60-1.

One of the major concerns of the Tractarians, for instance, was the question of Apostolic Succession, the resolution of which would not have done much to help the poor!

The quotation is taken from Arnold's Sermons, Vol. IV, 1841, p. ixv.

¹⁵ Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 59. Bamford is quoting from a sermon by Arnold.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 60. A further quotation from the same sermon.

¹⁷ See Thomas Arnold Sermons, Vol. II, p. 380, as quoted by Eugene L. Williamson, Jr., The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1964), pp. 88 and 89.

See also Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 358.

Arnold gives a much fuller discussion of this principle in the "Essay on the Right Interpretation of Scripture" in Volume II of his sermons.

See also the "Sermon on the Lord's Day" in Volume III of his sermons.

Lytton Strachey, Eminent Victorians (New York: The Modern Library, 1918), p. 221 also comments on this aspect of Arnold's thinking.

See also Thomas Arnold, Sermons: Chiefly on the Interpretation of Scripture, 3rd edition. (London: B. Fellowes, 1851), particularly p. 178.

¹⁸ Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 57-70, Chapter VII, passim presents a detailed discussion of Arnold's religious views, from which the writer has borrowed freely.

¹⁹ Sir Charles Lyell, Principles of Geology: Being an Attempt to Explain the Former Changes of the Earth's Surface by Reference to Causes Now in Operation, 1830.

Lyell was a pupil of William Buckland, the brother of Arnold's brother-in-law, John Buckland. Arnold had also attended William Buckland's lectures on geology and mineralogy at Oxford.

Strauss's Leben Jesu, published in 1835, stripped much of the supernatural from the story of Jesus and suggested that the Church had created Jesus, rather than vice versa.

²⁰Thomas Arnold, "Essay on the Right Interpretation and Understanding of the Scriptures," Sermons II, 4th edition, (London: B. Fellowes, 1845), p. 421.

²¹See Williamson, op. cit., p. 68.

See also L. E. Elliot-Binns, Religion in the Victorian Era (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1936).

²²See Williamson, op. cit., p. 95.

²³See E. Maitland, "Life and Writings of Dr. Arnold," North British Review II (February, 1845), p. 403, in particular.

See also Anon., "Dr. Arnold after Fifty Years," Spectator, LXVIII, (18 June, 1892), p. 840, and,

Williamson, op. cit., pp. 95-111 for a full discussion of the influence of Arnold on these men and the part they played in propagating his views.

²⁴Thomas Arnold, "Principles of Church Reform," as quoted by Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 61-2.

See also Strachey, op. cit., p. 218.

²⁵Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 62.

²⁶See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 91.

²⁷Ibid., p. 94.

²⁸Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 287. Letter to an old pupil, dated Rugby, October 30, 1841. Letter no: CCLXXXIII.

²⁹Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 100.

The complete article is reprinted in Arnold Whitridge, Dr. Arnold of Rugby (London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1928), Appendix I.

The title "The Oxford Malignant" was given to the article by the editor of the Edinburgh Review, and Arnold had nothing to do with it. Nevertheless the title expresses the tone of the article very well, and it is doubtful whether Arnold would have wanted to have it altered.

There are a number of Arnold's letters in which he discusses the Hampden controversy and which throw considerable light on his views. See, for example, Stanley, op. cit., letters no: CXXIV; CXXV; and CXXVII in particular. See also letters no: CXXIX; CXXXIII; CXXXV; CXLV and CXLVIII for further comment on the Tractarians.

³⁰See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 103-4.

³¹Letter to Hawkins, dated November 4, 1835. Quoted in Wymer, op. cit., p. 170.

Stanley, op. cit., pp. 15-7, reprints this letter, but omits the part quoted by Wymer because the previous letter he prints includes a section which is almost word-for-word with the letter to Hawkins. This second letter, no: CXV, pp. 13-5, Vol. II, dated November 18, 1835 and addressed to Mr. Justice Coleridge, also includes a request to Coleridge for advice on the MS of a proposed pamphlet on the Admission of Dissenters into the Universities.

The whole question of Arnold's involvement with the University of London, from his acceptance through to his resignation, receives full coverage in Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 10-130, passim, mostly in the form of Arnold's personal correspondence.

³²Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 92-4. Letter to W. Empson, dated Rugby, November 18; 1837.

See also Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 124.

³³The only result of his efforts was the establishment of a voluntary Scriptural Examination in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and in the Greek text of the New Testament, and in Scriptural History. See Stanley, op. cit., pp. 12-3.

³⁴Ibid., Vol. I, p. 278. Stanley is quoting Arnold without stating his source.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 209-10.

³⁷The best sources for Arnold's views towards the poor and the reforms that were necessary, as well as what he tried to do to assist them, are Stanley, op. cit., passim; the Miscellaneous Works, passim, and particularly pp. 171-224 and 452-502; Sir Joshua Fitch, Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education (New York: Charles Scribener's Sons, 1899), pp. 118-134; Wymer, op. cit., gives some indication of his work in this direction, as does Bamford, 1960, op. cit., although Bamford tends to play down Arnold's efforts.

See also T. W. Bamford, ed. Thomas Arnold on Education (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), in which Bamford gives excerpts from many of Arnold's works. See, in particular, pp. 58-9.

See also Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 203-7, for a letter originally printed in the Sheffield Courant. Arnold advocated the formation of a society to collect the facts about the condition of the poor--a mass survey, in fact. See the Hertford Reformer, November 9, 1839, reprinted in Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 482-6.

³⁸See Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 234; 321; and Vol. II, p. 56.

See also Wymer, op. cit., pp. 75-6 and 143-4.

³⁹See Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 79-170; 225-239; 431-516, passim.

⁴⁰Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 389. Letter to Chevalier Bunsen, dated Rugby, September 29, 1834. Letter no: LXXXVII.

⁴¹Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., p. 214. Reprint of a letter to the Sheffield Courant on the condition of the working classes.

⁴²Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 98. Letter to J. C. Platt, dated Rugby, December 6, 1837. Letter no: CLXV.

⁴³See P. J. Miller, "Women's Education, Self-Improvement and Social Mobility--a Late Eighteenth Century Debate," p. 1. Unpublished paper. University of Alberta, January, 1971, and W. E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind 1870-1870 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957) passim.

⁴⁴Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 395. Arnold's Travelling Journal, written at Dover, August 11, 1837.

⁴⁵See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 32-4.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 125-6.

⁴⁷For Arnold's views on emigration see his letter to the Sheffield Courant, reprinted in Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., as Letter no: VIII, pp. 198-202.

See also Wymer, op. cit., p. 135, where a letter to the Rev. Penrose is quoted in which Arnold says he would not be averse to his children emigrating in the event of his death. There are a number of other occasions when Arnold speaks of emigration, either in general, or for his pupils, or for himself. His main aversion to it, at least for himself, was the fact that the colonies were peopled by convicts, ex-convicts and the descendants of convicts. Otherwise he was convinced of the benefits to be derived from emigrating. For a few examples of his comments on the subject see Bamford, 1970, op. cit., pp. 144-9 and Stanley, op. cit., various letters, particularly those addressed to J. P. Gell and to Sir J. Franklin.

⁴⁸See Arnold's letter to J. P. Gell, dated Rugby, March 15, 1839. Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 150-1. Letter no: CXCII.

⁴⁹See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 27.

⁵⁰Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 401. Letter to the Rev. F. C. Blackstone, dated Fox How, January 29, 1835.

⁵¹Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 77.

⁵²Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 296. Letter to his sister Susanna, dated Rugby, April, 1831. Letter no: XXIX.

⁵³Ibid., p. 297. Letter to W. W. Hull, dated Rugby, May 2, 1831. Letter no: XXX.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 317. Letter to the Rev. G. Cornish, dated Rugby, June 9, 1832. Letter no: XLVI.

⁵⁵Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 47.

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 32-4.

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 43-4.

⁵⁸Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 271-3. Letter to the Rev. Dr. Hawkins, dated Rugby, November, 1830. Letter no: XX.

⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 281-3. Letter to J. T. Coleridge, dated Rugby, November 1, 1830. Letter no: XXI.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 363. Letter to the Rev. G. Cornish, dated Allan Bank, Grasmere, August 18, 1833.

⁶²Ibid., p. 333.

See also Bamford, 1960, Chapter VIII, passim.

⁶³Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 334 quotes Arnold, but gives no source.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 338.

Stanley, being an ardent admirer of Arnold, may be exaggerating but nevertheless he was a pupil there and, presumably, had some idea of the general feeling towards Arnold. Stanley was somewhat isolated at school, however, and had a few close friends, such as Lake and Vaughan, who were also admirers of the headmaster. Even if the statement is applicable to a few, however, it still shows Arnold's ability to arouse strong affection.

⁶⁵When Stanley's work was published every major magazine and journal reviewed it, many spending thirty or forty pages on it. Almost invariably the reviewers note that Arnold's reputation had risen and was still rising.

⁶⁶See Samuel Eliot, "Dr. Arnold as a Teacher," The American Journal of Education, Vol. 4, no: 3, pp. 545-81.

⁶⁷See Bamford, 1970, op. cit., pp. 25-9, for remarks regarding the professional aspects of Arnold's influence.

Arnold's correspondence has many references to his acquisition of land, shares, stocks, etc.

⁶⁸Houghton, op. cit., passim.

⁶⁹T. Arnold, Passages in a Wandering Life, (1900), p. 9. As quoted by Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 209.

⁷⁰Cowes was a military as well as a commercial port. It was fortified against possible attack from Napoleon, of whom the islanders were in constant fear. The young Arnold was very knowledgeable about ships, flags, foreign countries and England well before he was six. He also wrote plays and there is one, written in pencil, which is retained in the archives of Rugby School and shows a grasp of language, metre, etc., which is far in advance of most six year olds.

See Wymer, op. cit., pp. 15-6, and Stanley, op. cit., p. 14, for details of his early achievements. The detail in this section is taken from Wymer unless otherwise stated.

⁷¹By the time he was six he had been awarded three or four other history books, a two volume history of Rome and a set of geography cards of the world. See Wymer, loc cit.

⁷²See Wymer, op. cit., p. 22.

Draughts: the game known as checkers in North America.
Casino: a card-game.

⁷³For a full account of Arnold's life at Winchester see Wymer, op. cit., Chapter II.

⁷⁴3,000 lines seems an impossible amount, yet this is the figure given by Wymer, ibid., p. 29.

⁷⁵"Fagging" or "to fag" means to force junior boys to perform menial tasks, such as cleaning boots, running errands, preparing meals (often illegally) etc. The noun, "a fag" is one who is fagged. i. e., he is the one to clean boots, etc.

In some public schools the expression "to fag" can also mean to work hard at one's books. "To swot" or "to cram" are other terms with the same meaning.

The thrashings by the headmaster were called "Biblings" at Winchester. The headmaster, traditionally dressed in a cocked hat and a gown, gave wrongdoers anything from six to fifty strokes with a "Bibling Rod" made of apple twigs, on their backs, which were first bared by the prefects. For a full account of life at Winchester College see J. D'E Firth, Winchester College (Winchester P. & G. Wells Ltd., 1949).

⁷⁶Arnold mentions his schooldays on occasion in his correspondence and is said to have adapted the Winchester tradition of prefects to fit his Rugby system. In an article written to defend flogging and fagging he signed himself "A Wykehamist." See "On the Discipline of Public Schools," Quarterly Journal of Education, 1835, reprinted in Thomas Arnold (ed. by A. P. Stanley) The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D. D. (London: B. Fellowes, 1845), pp. 363-379.

⁷⁷In a letter to his aunt in March, 1809, Arnold says: "Why are we to pore over the writings of Cicero when those of Xenophon and Demosthenes afford models of composition, surely equal if not superior? I am quite tired of the pompous boasts which are everywhere to be met with in Classical writers, especially Cicero. --I verily believe that half at least of the Roman History is, if not totally false, at least scandalously exaggerated. How far different are the modest unaffected and impartial narratives of Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon." As quoted by Wymer, op. cit., p. 31; and also Stanley, op. cit., p. 5.

⁷⁸See, for instance, Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 87.

⁷⁹Wymer, op. cit., p. 36, quotes the letter but gives no further information.

⁸⁰Private communication from Mr. Peter Gwyn, the Archivist of Winchester College, dated 19th July, 1971.

⁸¹The information on Arnold's activities at Winchester are obtained from Wymer, op. cit., Chapter 2, passim; Firth, op. cit., pp. 114-6; Mr. Gwyn's letter, loc cit., and various letters, or copies of letters in a number of locations.

⁸²Stanley, op. cit., p. 6, says, "In 1811, in his 16th year, he was elected as a scholar at Corpus Christi College, Oxford;" Wymer, op. cit., p. 36, says he was "not yet sixteen, . . ." but Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 4, says that "he was sixteen at the time," It seems most likely that Bamford has misread Stanley on this occasion.

⁸³The best of the Winchester boys normally went on to New College, Oxford, which was also founded by William of Wykeham, but entry was by election. Thomas Arnold was listed nineteenth on the Election Roll of 1810, and that year there were vacancies for only two. Therefore Thomas went to Corpus Christi, which was the college to which his elder brother, Matthew, had gone. See Wymer, op. cit., p. 37.

In typical fashion Bamford records the event as follows: "... (Arnold) went to Oxford, not to New College, where the brighter boys went, but to Corpus Christi." Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 4.

⁸⁴The expressions "go up" and "come down" (to university) are commonly used to mean both to enter and leave, and also to start and finish a term. The question: "Have the students come down yet?" would make perfect sense to anyone connected with English university life.

⁸⁵There were "...twenty fellows and twenty scholars, with four exhibitioners, (to) form the foundation. No independent members were admitted except gentlemen commoners, and they were limited to six. Of the scholars several were bachelors, and the whole number of students actually under college tuition seldom exceeded twenty." Letter from Mr. Justice Coleridge, written to Stanley to be included as part of Arnold's biography. Quoted by Stanley, op. cit., p. 9.

Coleridge also notes that the scholarships were competed for in examinations that were conducted with creditable strictness and impartiality, "qualities at that time more rare in college elections than now." i. e., 1843, some thirty-two years later.

⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 11 and 12.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 12.

⁸⁸Of these John Keble has a special status. He was the

originator of the Oxford Movement, although not its most well-known advocate. It was his publication, in 1827, of "The Christian Year" which gave expression, and beautiful expression, to the spirit of which the Tractarians were to become the principal exponents. Friendship between Arnold and a man with Tractarian views was obviously difficult, and, in fact, for many years intercourse between Keble and Arnold ceased, but this was due to Keble, not Arnold, who was always anxious to re-establish friendly relations. Arnold had the ability to divorce personalities from their views, but this unusual ability was not shared by Keble. It has been suggested that a reconciliation was in the offing at the time of Arnold's death. Certainly few things would have made Arnold happier; his estrangement from the saintly Keble was a matter of great distress to him, and one that he failed to understand.

See also Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 167, and Wymer, op. cit., p. 67, who quotes Trevenen Penrose as saying that all Arnold's vehemence was against principles not men.

See also Arnold's letter to the Rev. John Tucker, March 4, 1827, reproduced in Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 80-1.

⁸⁹This was Samuel Taylor Coleridge, uncle of Mr. Justice Coleridge, from whose letter to Stanley these details are taken. Stanley, op. cit., pp. 7-24.

⁹⁰Coleridge says of Arnold that he never knew a man who made such familiar and fond use of an author as Arnold did of Aristotle. Arnold decided, many years later, to send his son to Oxford, despite his fears about the state that university was in, because there he would study Aristotle, whereas at Cambridge he would not. He wrote a Lexicon for Thucydides after he had left Oxford, which took several years to complete. His Rugby pupils were also exposed to his love for these two authors.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 18.

In 1830, 1833 and 1835 he published a three-volume edition of Thucydides.

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Ibid., pp. 18-9.

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 22-3.

⁹⁵Wymer, op. cit., p. 41. Wymer gives no further details.

⁹⁶The Wye Tour had become fashionable after 1802 when Nelson, in the company of Sir William and Lady Hamilton had sailed down the

river. Arnold and his companion, Penrose, decided to walk. Walking was much cheaper than sailing.

⁹⁷Letter to Mrs. Susan Delafield, dated Corpus Christi College, March 22, 1811. Rugby MS.

⁹⁸Letter to G. Cornish, dated Laleham, September 4, 1821. Rugby MS.

⁹⁹Letter to the Rev. G. Cornish, dated Fox How, February 5, 1837. Reproduced in Stanley, op. cit., pp. 73-4, Letter no: CLI.

¹⁰⁰Letter to Mrs. Susan Delafield, dated Pitt's Buildings, March 25, 1813. Rugby MS. There are a number of letters in which Arnold speaks of walking similar distances.

¹⁰¹There is some doubt as to which of these prizes was won in each year. Stanley says: "...he gained the Chancellor's prize for the two University Essays, Latin and English, for the years 1815 and 1817." Stanley, op. cit., p. 6.

Wymer gives a similar account: "...in the same year, 1815, Arnold surprised them all, and himself, by winning the Chancellor's Latin essay prize; and two years later he crowned this success by gaining a similar award for the best English essay." Wymer, op. cit., p. 49.

Bamford, however, records that "...he presented an essay which won the English Prize and was read in the Theatre at Oxford on 7 June 1815, eleven days before Waterloo and six days before his own twentieth birthday." He then says: "The essay which won Arnold the Prize in 1815 was called 'The Effects of distant Colonization on the Parent State'." op. cit., p. 9.

¹⁰²See Wymer, op. cit., p. 55.

Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 12, in describing Arnold's hesitation about becoming a schoolmaster, says: "Arnold, therefore, became a member of the great legion of graduates who turned to teaching only as a last resort. In this respect times have hardly changed at all."

¹⁰³Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 37.

¹⁰⁴Stanley quotes a letter of Arnold written in 1821, in which he says that lenity is seldom to be repented of, and that if a mistake has been made then expulsion can always follow, but every effort should be made to make an impression on the boy first. Ibid., pp. 38-9.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., pp. 41-2.

Bonamy Price wrote this section for inclusion in Stanley's work.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., Vol I, p. 72.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 49.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 72. Letter to the Rev. John Tucker, dated Laleham, February 22, 1824. Letter no: XI.

¹¹⁰See Wymer, op. cit., pp. 6-7, and Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 16.

¹¹¹Ibid., pp. 36-7. Stanley quotes the letter, but gives only the year in which it was written, 1831.

¹¹²Wymer, op. cit., pp. 68-9 mentions these activities, giving a considerable amount of incidental detail without disclosing his sources. Arnold's letters do substantiate much of Wymer's factual information, but either he had other sources or he is embellishing the facts in order to make a good story.

See Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 56-94, passim.

¹¹³Letter to his wife, dated Halesworth, January 7, 1825. He speaks of himself and Whately throwing spears. Rugby MS.

¹¹⁴Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 38-9. Stanley gives only the year of the letter and no addressee.

See also ibid., Vol. I, p. 317, letter to the Rev. G. Cornish, dated Rugby, June 9, 1832. Letter no: XLVI. Arnold again uses a games metaphor here.

¹¹⁵His children, at this time, were: Jane, born 1821; Matthew, 1822; Thomas, 1823; a girl who survived only a few days, 1824; Mary, 1825; Edward Penrose, 1826; William Delafield, 1828.

¹¹⁶Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 47, and pp. 49-50 gives both of these quotations without naming a source.

¹¹⁷Letter to J. T. Coleridge, dated Laleham, April 25, 1828. Arnold writes: "...it is good for us to leave Laleham, because I feel that we are daily getting to regard it as too much of a home." Stanley, Vol. I, op. cit., p. 90.

¹¹⁸Letter to Whately, dated November 2, 1827. Quoted by Wymer, op. cit., p. 84.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 85. Continuation of same letter.

¹²⁰See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 20-1, for a discussion of the merits of the other candidates. Wymer, op. cit., pp. 85-6, notes that there were over fifty candidates, including a number of masters from Public Schools. e.g., there were at least two from Charterhouse and one from Harrow.

¹²¹On December 28, 1827, Arnold wrote to Hawkins: "...you have a most particular claim on my thanks for your active kindness in the whole business, and for your character of me to Sir H. Halford, that I was likely to improve generally the system of public education, a statement which Sir H. Halford told me had weighed most strongly in my favour." Quoted by Stanley, op. cit., p. 84.

¹²²Ibid., p. 84. All quotations in this paragraph are taken from the letter cited in footnote 59.

¹²³Letter to Rev. E. Hawkins, dated Laleham, October 21, 1827, quoted ibid., p. 82. Letter no: XX.

¹²⁴Letter to Rev. George Cornish, dated Laleham, November 30, 1827. Quoted ibid., p. 83. Letter no: XXI.

Some of the letters of A. H. Clough, written while he was a boy at Rugby, suggest that Arnold was right in his estimation and that conditions were bad at least as late as 1835. See Bodleian MS Engl. lett. C. 189. This suggestion is confirmed by Arnold's own letters in which, throughout his career, he constantly refers to the evil in the school.

See Stanley, op. cit., passim; Rugby MS; Bodleian MS, and other collections of Arnold's letters.

¹²⁵Letter to the Rev. J. Tucker, dated December 28, 1827. Quoted Stanley, op. cit., pp. 83-4. Letter no: XXII.

See also letter to the Rev. J. Tucker, dated Laleham, March 2 (1828). Quoted ibid., pp. 85-6. Letter no: XXIV.

¹²⁶Letter to the Rev. F. C. Blackstone, dated Laleham, March 14, 1828. Quoted ibid., pp. 86-7. Letter no: XXV.

See also letters XX to XXXII, ibid., pp. 82-94; especially nos: XXIX; XXXI and XXXII.

¹²⁷See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 94-104 for a detailed discussion.

¹²⁸Following the press attacks upon Arnold's handling of the case of the boy March, the staff, with one exception, signed a joint, public letter stating that the punishment, if deserved, would not have been too severe. While the loyalty they displayed is commendable, as Bamford says, they probably did Arnold more harm than good, as it would seem to be a confirmation that brutality did exist in the school and that it was supported by the staff.

See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 52.

¹²⁹The fact that Old Rugbeians tended to stay together and to think of themselves as different from the rest of the undergraduates did not endear them to people. They were accused of being prigs; mature beyond their years; overly serious and supercilious.

See David Newsome, Godliness and Good Learning (London: John Murray, 1961), pp. 50-61, passim.

¹³⁰Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 162-3.

¹³¹Wymer, op. cit., pp. 150-3.

See also Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 230-2.

¹³²Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 247-8. Letter to W. W. Hull, dated Fox How, January 15, 1841.

¹³³See letter to Mrs. R. Penrose, dated January 21, 1838. Rugby MS.

¹³⁴See Wymer op. cit., p. 142.

See also letter from Matthew Arnold to William and Susan Arnold, dated East Cowes, July 10, 1836. Rugby MS, and letter to Mr. Hatch, dated Fox How, July 31, 1835. Rugby MS.

¹³⁵See Wymer, op. cit., pp. 150-3.

¹³⁶See Stanley, op. cit., p. 34, where he quotes Arnold as saying: "I believe that naturally I am one of the most ambitious men alive."

¹³⁷In today's terminology "intermediaries" might well be replaced by "lobbyists."

Bamford, op. cit., p. 31, says that Whately happened to be visiting Arnold at Rugby when the offer reached him, and that he decided to accept while he was in the Schoolhouse garden. Bamford points out that Arnold very likely knew how close he had come to receiving the offer himself, so that the situation was somewhat poignant.

Church appointments were made by the Prime Minister, and tended, therefore, to be political. Lord Melbourne, the then Prime Minister, felt himself unable to elevate Arnold knowing the furor that such an appointment would create and which would redound on his government. The major reason for his decision was undoubtedly the Hampden affair. Arnold's article "The Oxford Malignants" had raised a storm and the timing was bad; there had been no time for the furious emotions to have abated sufficiently for Arnold's preferment to have been accepted quietly. Lord Melbourne really had little choice, however good Arnold's claims might have been. When asked why he had not given Arnold preferment, Melbourne is reported to have replied: "What have Tory Churchmen ever done for me that I should make them a present of such a handle against my government?" Quoted by Bamford, op. cit., l. 104. Bamford also reports that Melbourne wrote to Arnold blaming the Hampden affair for the decision. The Lichfield post went to Samuel Butler, headmaster of Shrewsbury school.

¹³⁸ Letter to Chevalier Bunsen, from Arnold, dated June 13, 1840, as quoted in Stanley, op. cit., p. 220, Vol. II. Letter no: CCXXXIX.

¹³⁹ To Chevalier Bunsen from Arnold, dated September 4, 1840. Quoted ibid., pp. 223-4. Letter no: CCXLII.

¹⁴⁰ Quoted by Bamford, op. cit., p. 146.

¹⁴¹ See letter to Justice Coleridge, dated September 1, 1841, for Arnold's reaction to the appointment. Quoted in Stanley, op. cit., p. 280. Vol. II.

¹⁴² See Wymer, op. cit., p. 189, and Bamford, op. cit., p. 166.

Correspondence Arnold had with various of his friends at this time shows that, as usual, everything was not completely simple.

See, for example, Arnold's letter to Hawkins, dated from Fox How, December 26, 1841, Rugby MS. This letter is also quoted in Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 305, but the original, in Rugby School, has more details than Stanley gives.

The correspondence shows that Arnold was concerned about taking an oath, which appeared to be a necessary part of taking office. In the event he was not required to swear. The problems of the numbers of lectures he was to give each year and the forfeiture of his salary were also not solved too easily. The University Regulations were such that if he did not comply with them, then his whole stipend was forfeit, but would be used to purchase stocks and he would then receive the profits at such time as he was able to abide by the regulations. There was no provision for the moneys to be used to provide scholarships as Arnold wished. In the end all the problems were solved and Arnold achieved one of his dearest ambitions. The professorship would have

given him a small, but assured, income after he left Rugby, which was a matter of some concern to him at that time. The fact that he now had nine children to care for obviously accentuated his fears.

¹⁴³The correspondence quoted by Stanley tends to give this impression of slowing down, but it is greatly heightened by reading the original MSS in the Temple Reading Room at Rugby School, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, etc. It is not so much what Arnold says in these letters as the way in which he says it, and the actual calligraphy. Until the last years of his life his writing was clear, legible and firm, with every appearance of having been written at speed. His last letters are untidy, less legible and lack the purposefulness of the earlier documents. In a letter to Coleridge, dated May 28, 1837, he notes that his work is too laborious for him to remain at Rugby into old age. Bodleian MS Eng. Lett. d. 130. In a letter the following year he hints to Coleridge that he would soon be retiring. Bodleian MS Eng. Lett d. 175. See also Rugby MS., letter to Hawkins cited in footnote 87. In a letter to the Rev. Henry Balston, dated September 9, 1840, he says he is working on Thucydides, but now takes little interest in it. This admission, more than almost anything else, shows that Arnold was no longer the same vigorous man he had been. At that time he was only forty-five years old.

¹⁴⁴Stanley, in common with a number of authors, stresses the numerous occasions during the last year or so of his life in which Arnold comments upon the shortness of life and expresses the hope that he may live to complete the work on which he is engaged. All of this seems to give a prophetic look to his writings. However, it seems likely that although he may have been more than usually concerned with the thought of death, he was simply expressing a devout man's belief in the mortality of man and his reliance upon his God for the fortune to complete whatever he put his hand to. It would seem probable that those who investigated his papers after his death read more into such utterances than Arnold had intended. See, for example, the letters quoted regarding his application for the Rugby post, in which he constantly uses phrases such as "If my health and strength be spared me." At this time he was a vigorous thirty-three year old.

¹⁴⁵This is the young master of Tom Brown's School-days; the man who was to make Marlborough into a first-class school, and the future Bishop of Calcutta. See Chapter VI of this text for a description of his life and work.

¹⁴⁶Wymer, in common with most authors, says that Cotton broke off the engagement. See Wymer, op. cit., p. 192.

There is, however, correspondence from Arnold which makes it clear that it was Arnold who broke off the engagement because he thought Cotton too cold and too much influenced by his mother who was against the marriage. See letter to Coleridge, dated Rugby, May 21, 1842. Bodleian MS Eng. lett. d. 130.

¹⁴⁷The spot is marked by a tablet let into the floor of Rugby School Chapel. There is also an effigy of Arnold on the north wall of the Chapel. It seems to be a poor likeness and is an inferior piece of art. Directly below it is a similar, but far superior, effigy of A. P. Stanley. The windows above and behind these effigies are dedicated to Mary Arnold, Dr. Arnold's wife. The school also possesses an imposing bust of Arnold, which was made some fifty years after his death and may, therefore, not be too accurate a likeness. It is of heroic proportions and is a striking piece of work, nonetheless.

A number of writers have commented upon the effect Arnold's death had on those who knew him. One of the boys at the school wrote to his uncle two days after: "I arrived at Bradford yesterday afternoon in consequence of the dreadful event of Dr. Arnold's discease (sic). This great public and double great private loss (sic) occurred early calamaty

on Sunday morning last, . . . such a general gloom prevailed over the whole town of Rugby, the consequence of the death of Dr. Arnold & so great was the sorrow of the boys themselves that each felt it a great relief to quit the place on Monday morning." Letter from John Wood to his uncle, Tuesday, June 14, 1842. Rugby MS.



ENTRANCE TO THE HALL
RUGBY SCHOOL, 1809.



THE GREAT SCHOOL, 1777.

PART II

ARNOLD AND RUGBY SCHOOL

CHAPTER IV

RUGBY SCHOOL PRIOR TO ARNOLD'S TENURE

There is a little town, within short space
Of England's central point, of various brick
Irregularly built, nor much adorned
By architectural craft--save that indeed,
As you approach it from the south, a pile
Of questionable Gothic lifts its head
With somewhat of a grave collegiate air,
Not unbefitting what in truth it is, --
A seat of academic discipline . . .

. . . But for this

The place might pass unnoticed--to speak truth,
As insignificant a market-town
As may be seen in England. ¹

John Moultrie

Through the ages, and especially since the Reformation, many men have given money for the establishment of schools in which poor children could receive a free, or nearly free, education. Until the middle of the sixteenth century the Church tended to be the main beneficiary, when men with money to spare made their Wills. Often this money was donated so that masses might be said for the donator's soul, or was given to support the priests, or in order to beautify the church. However, as some of the superstitions of the medieval period became less potent, more men left their money to found schools, a procedure which meant that their names would be remembered kindly long after they were dead. Such a man was Laurence Sherriffe.²

Sherriffe's name has come down through the ages, but very little else is known about him. He is reputed to have been born in Rugby of parents who were locally prominent enough to own the "most considerable house" in Rugby, and to be buried in the parish church.³ Apart from that information, which is not even certain,⁴ nothing is known about Sherriffe's birth, education and early life. It is known, however, that by 1551 Princess Elizabeth was buying spices from Sherriffe who was then a "grosser and one that did sell spices in the City of London."⁵ His relationship with Elizabeth has left one story which aids in forming a picture of the man who founded Rugby School. It appears that Sherriffe used to frequent the Rose Tavern, and on one visit was incensed by a friend and neighbour who had the temerity to call Princess Elizabeth a "Jill." Laurence leaped to her defence and told Robert Farrer that he would report him, which he did, taking his story to Bonner, the Bishop of London. As Elizabeth was under

watch, and considered to be a threat by Queen Mary at the time, Sherriffe's action was brave, not to say foolhardy. However, Bonner promised to reprimand Farrer, and there the matter rested.⁶ It seems likely that Elizabeth did not forget her champion, for after she came to the throne she continued to purchase spices from him and he prospered and became wealthy. In 1566 he became vice-warden of the Worshipful Company of Grocers and, in the same year, he bought the parsonage at Brownsover, a small village adjoining Rugby. He was also given a grant of arms from the Herald's College, the same as that now used by the school.

In 1567 he made his will during an illness and added an Intent which detailed the directions for carrying out the terms of his will in respect to his free grammar school. Then followed the good fortune without which Rugby would almost certainly have remained a small, country, grammar school. Sherriffe recovered from his illness sufficiently to make a journey to Rugby, and while there he made a codicil to his will in which he changed the value of his bequest to the school from one hundred pounds to one hundred and six pounds, thirteen shillings and fourpence. A trifling difference, and yet one of considerable importance and consequence. The reason the change was so significant was that in his will Sherriffe left cash, but in his codicil he altered the cash grant to one of land. In fact he left eight acres of land called Lamb's Conduit Close, the rent from which came to some eight pounds per year. This minor alteration has resulted in Rugby's present fortunes, for the piece of land, situate in the county of Middlesex, is now worth many thousands of pounds per annum.

Sherriffe died in September, 1567, and, contrary to his wishes, for he wanted to be buried in Rugby after a funeral in London, he was buried in the churchyard of Christchurch, Newgate Street, London. The school was destined not to benefit immediately from Sherriffe's change of mind, for he appointed two trustees,⁷ George Harrison and Barnard Field, and the first soon died, while the second "coolly appropriated the rents of the London property to himself."⁸ After the usurper, Field, died, his daughter carried on her father's ill-practice and from her the land passed through several hands until it looked as though Rugby would lose it forever. It is said that the Masters of the school made numerous efforts to have the land restored to the school, but with a complete lack of success. Worse yet, the founder's kin, who were tenants of another piece of land near Rugby, "behaved almost as badly."⁹

Fortunately for the school, justice eventually triumphed. In 1614 the property was restored to the charity, all the arrears paid off and twelve trustees were appointed.¹⁰ This decision was, in fact, a confirmation of a decree of 1602, issued following an inquisition held at Rugby by a Commission, in which the sale of Lamb's Conduit was set aside and the school property vested in a body of twelve trustees.¹¹ However, despite the rulings of 1602 and 1614 the school still had problems of a financial nature, and the masters continued in a state of great hardship and poverty. A witness at an inquisition held in 1653, for example, reported that "the Schoole house end in all his tyme was stopped with straw to keepe out rain and wind."¹² The problems with the property that Sherriffe had left the school in

Brownsover were not finally settled until 1670, when the then tenant, William Howkins, was gaoled.

The school was, evidently, not built until 1574, some seven years after Sherriffe's death. "It was a long lofty room attached to the back of the mansion house, having one door leading into the house and another at the north end leading outwards."¹³ In 1621 the first Old Rugbeian known to enter either university, one George Isham, became an undergraduate at Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

The list of headmasters is imperfectly known, but for many years the "honest, discreete, and Learned Man, being a Master of Arts" who held the post was ill-rewarded for his services, often not even receiving the "Some of Twelve poundes" that Sherriffe had bequeathed for him.¹⁴ The salary paid to Knightley Harrison, appointed headmaster in 1670, shows the improved financial state of the school by that time, for he was paid forty pounds a year, having started at thirty-four pounds. Both sums were considerably above the fifteen pounds a year received by his predecessor.

In 1675 Harrison was succeeded by Robert Ashbridge, of Queen's College, Oxford, who first started the School Register. In Ashbridge's first year the Register shows that twenty-six boys entered, nearly half of whom were not on the foundation and came from a distance. Obviously even this early Rugby School had more than a purely local reputation.

The first of Rugby's headmasters to make a reputation for himself that has survived to modern times is Henry Holyoake, whose tenure lasted forty-three years, from 1688 to 1731, when he died.

Holyoake "greatly increased the numbers and prestige of the school,"¹⁵ but there is no mention of any assistant masters being hired until 1705, and then the reason appears to have been that Holyoake was offered the Rectory at Bilton. In fact he held two livings near Rugby as well as retaining his post as Master of the school. Despite his conflicting interests Holyoake managed to attract a number of the sons of noblemen and baronets during his tenure. Towards the end of the seventeenth century Holyoake was holding a Speech Day.¹⁶ The trustees met four times a year, but the major meeting was held in August, and at that time the boys recited their compositions.

Holyoake died in 1731, and the buildings were, presumably, in a reasonable state of repair, but in 1748

...the School-house, and other buildings belonging to the charity, being in so ruinous a state that it was found impracticable to repair them, the trustees applied to Parliament for authority to rebuild them. A statute was accordingly enacted in that year, 21 Geo. II., cap. 23, entitled 'An Act for raising money out of an estate in the county of Middlesex, given by Lawrence Sheriff, for the founding and maintaining a School and Almshouses at Rugby, in the county of Warwick, to be applied in rebuilding the said School, or purchasing one or more messuage or messuages, together with some ground thereto; and for the better support of the said charity.'¹⁷

It is interesting to note that not only does the Act state that the buildings were in too ruinous a state to be repaired, but that the "School-house was in too confined a situation, and without any ground or inclosure adjoining for the exercise and recreation of the boys, which was consequently attended with many inconveniences both to the master and scholars..."¹⁸ The private Act was passed and the trustees were enabled to raise eighteen hundred pounds on a mortgage of the Conduit Close property.

Of this sum they spent £ 1,000 in buying a house, on the site of the present schoolhouse, outside the town, with three fields, 8 acres in extent, adjoining, which became a playground for the boys, who formerly had none. Until 1816 the 'Pond Close,' with its 'island,' remained the principal scene of the boys' play, which was not organized as in later days. A big schoolroom was built on the west side of the house, and the boys were removed to it in 1750, when the old school was at once pulled down.¹⁹

In 1777 a new constitution was drawn up by Sir John Eardley Wilmot, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, who had been elected a trustee in 1770. The new constitution was incorporated in another private Act which was passed in 1777. The lease of the Middlesex property was approaching its end, and it was expected that the school's income would be increased to about £ 2,000 a year after it had expired. For the first time provision was made for assistant masters, at a salary not exceeding £ 80 per annum, and for a writing master at £ 40. The headmaster was to benefit from the extra money by an increase of £ 5 in his salary, which would give him £ 113:6:8d, and he was also to receive a capitation fee of £ 3 for each of the free scholars, who were, by the terms of Sherriffe's will, all those boys from Rugby, Brownsover and within five measured miles. Eight exhibitions, of £ 40 per annum, which were tenable for seven years at either Oxford or Cambridge were also founded at this time.²⁰

The first master to take office under the new constitution was an Etonian, Dr. Thomas James, who declared that he governed by "the principles of justice . . . rather than by the terror of the rod, though I have established that on all becoming occasions."²¹ Up to Dr. James' time the boys had attended service in the parish church, but he instituted a Sunday service in the school with one of the masters

as chaplain.²² Certainly during James' tenure, and probably before, the boys could pay extra "for the luxury of a separate bed."²³

Apart from a short period at the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the French War had an effect, the school grew steadily. James was certainly instrumental in making it a school of more than local repute. In the first half of the seventeenth century there were about fifty or sixty boys in the school and it was not until the nineteenth century that the numbers rose above a hundred.²⁴

Like most schools of the eighteenth century, Rugby experienced periods of turbulence and unrest. James had to quell two rebellions, which he did effectively. His successor, Dr. Henry Ingles, who was known as the "Black Tiger," had to contend with the Great Rebellion, when the rioting became so uncontrollable that the army was called in, the boys were besieged on the Island;²⁵ the Riot Act was read, and the boys were eventually captured, to be thrashed or expelled.

Henry Ingles was followed by Dr. Wooll, whose tenure lasted from 1807 to 1828.²⁶ This was the period when many attacks were being made on the Public Schools.²⁷ Rugby throughout Wooll's tenure was no worse than the other Public Schools and may well have been considerably better in some ways. It retained the reputation which had been built up under Dr. James (1778-94) and acquired a splendid set of new buildings, giving it much the appearance that it has today. When Wooll took over the school there were 150 boys in the school, a number which he raised to 381, but then allowed to fall to the 123 which was the enrolment figure when Arnold took over. It is probably



inaccurate to say that Wooll "allowed" the numbers to fall for he apparently did nothing different during the period of decline from what he had done during the era of expansion. In fact, the question of why the numbers in schools rose and fell is one that has never been satisfactorily answered.²⁸ It is fair to say that Rugby prospered for the greater part of Wooll's reign, but that over the last seven years or so there was an inexplicable decline.

Wooll was a good scholar, if not outstanding. He had been a Fellow of New College and was Master of Midhurst School at the time of his election to Rugby. He was successful in his application for the headmastership of Rugby against the powerful bid of Samuel Butler, an Old Rugbeian and a scholar of the highest distinction, who was, at that time, headmaster of Shrewsbury School, where he remained until 1836, and has been hailed as a reformer in the Arnold mould. It is said that Wooll was given the position over Butler because the latter had already made a name for himself as a harsh disciplinarian. As it turned out Wooll was not averse to using the "barch" and while his pupils obtained high academic honours they did not do so well as Butler's from Shrewsbury, but then neither did anybody else's.

As a man, Wooll seems to have been well enough liked. "He succeeded, to a very remarkable degree, in winning the respect and affection of his pupils."²⁹ He is reported to have been a perfect gentleman and a good disciplinarian and his old scholars are said to have been unanimous in their expressions of regard and kindly recollection.³⁰ The public dinners that were held in Rugby on Speech Days were always well attended by Old Rugbeians, something which

was not always true in Arnold's time.³¹

One of Wooll's most famous Old Boys was Charles Williams Macready, the illustrious actor, who started on his acting career at Rugby, and was encouraged by Wooll. However, school theatricals were among the more pleasant aspects of Wooll's tenure; there were darker episodes.³² On one occasion the fags attempted a rebellion (in 1822) because they had been punished, by the headmaster, for a misdemeanour which they had not committed. The disturbance was quelled by expelling the ring-leaders, but the incident led to a mass departure of boys at the end of the half-year. At another time the walls of the school were covered with chalked messages urging the boys to "rise as one man," and demanding "BLOOD" in large letters. One of the assistant masters employed a little stratagem and, waiting until all the boys were ensconced in chapel, he searched the pockets of their week-day clothes, and found a piece of chalk in one. The boy, when confronted with the evidence, confessed and was expelled.

In 1813 occurred one of the incidents which clarifies the reasons for Wooll's reputation as a flogger. The boys in the Lower Fourth Form played a prank on their form-master who complained to Wooll. The headmaster informed the boys that the whole class would be flogged at three o'clock. Precisely on time Dr. Wooll appeared and commenced his task. All 38 boys in the form, including one who was not technically guilty with the others, were thrashed. The whole performance took exactly fifteen minutes. One of the boys who was involved is recorded as saying:

The lower Fourth form boys of that day, when they meet their surviving schoolfellows, always talk of this event as the jolliest fun they ever had when at Rugby.³³

The curious part is that the writer is obviously referring to the thrashing, not to the prank that led to the beating.

Wooll, like most headmasters of the period, is credited with several reforms.³⁴ He is reported to have restricted the numbers of boys who had the privilege of fagging, by limiting the power to the Sixth Form. It is also said that he stopped the initiation ceremony known as "clodding" whereby boys were forced to run the gauntlet between two lines of boys who hurled clods of clay at them as they ran. If a boy were unpopular the clods were kept hard and dry. This ceremony was reserved for those boys who were promoted into the Fifth Form, and for those who moved up into the Fourth Form there was a similar practice, which again Wooll is reputed to have stopped. In this second rite the newcomer was made to run the gauntlet between boys armed with handkerchiefs tied in "Westminster knots." The wiser of those who suffered this form of initiation padded themselves with old book covers and the like, but even so the punishment was severe. When these ceremonies were stopped, a substitute, known as a "guttle," which was the name given to the feed the newcomer provided for those of his new form who were members of his house, was instituted. The fags did the cooking. Certainly this was a more civilised way of welcoming a new boy.³⁵ While the cessation of these forms of initiation might have been caused by Dr. Wooll, it is certain that the "guttles" were not substituted by him, as it is reported that cooking hot meals was forbidden.³⁶

The custom of "chairing," which was yet another way of welcoming a new boy into a form, is also reputed to have been abolished by Wooll. This custom consisted of the newcomer being hoisted up by his fellows and pinched "in the most sensitive part of his body till he shrieked aloud with pain."³⁷ All of these initiation ceremonies, it is stated, were ended by Wooll in 1814.³⁸

Fighting was rife during Wooll's days,³⁹ as it was for many years after. Indeed it is unlikely that it will ever cease. At this period, however, it was a brutal pastime and boys were forced into participating by older boys who would match them and then goad them to fight to the bitter end. The attitudes of the fathers can be seen clearly reflected in the sons; where the older generation had their professional pugilists, the younger had small boys. Much of the ritual of the professional ring found its way into the Public School bouts and seconds and rounds were part of these miniature gladiatorial battles. Again, there is no evidence to suggest that Rugby was any different from the other schools of the period in this respect.

Football was the major sport, although cricket was also played. The boys, especially the younger ones, amused themselves with hoops, pegtops and marbles. It is said that a pair of praeposters were once so engrossed in their game of marbles that they failed to notice the time and therefore arrived very late for class. When they did eventually arrive, "...they were met with the stern looks of the headmaster, (Wooll) which they felt as a severe reprimand, and that was sufficient, for nothing more was said or done."⁴⁰ If true, this episode says much for Wooll and for his discipline.

Football was very much as it is recorded in Tom Brown's Schooldays, nearly twenty years later. It was unorganised; the rules were few, and unwritten, but understood by all; it was compulsory, in the sense that the boys were forced to play by their fellows, and it was primitive. It is said that in 1823 William Webb Ellis revolutionised the game by picking the ball up and running with it, instead of taking the kick that the rules allowed. Even if this story be true it seems that the change in the game was not accepted for several years, certainly after the end of Wooll's tenure.

Hare and hounds was another major activity in the period from Christmas to Easter. The trail that the hares laid down was paper for the principal runs, and sawdust for the less-important. An interesting pastime which appeared for a short time was the making of and playing with "Cars." These were wooden vehicles that would seat one person and were drawn by a number of juniors pulling on a rope attached to the front. They must have borne a great resemblance to the carts used by today's children in their Soap-box Derbies. Even if these cars were not actively supported by Wooll as a suitable pastime, they certainly did not meet with his official disapproval and ceased to be used only when interest had waned.

At this time most of the boys boarded in the town, but between 1809 and 1813 the School House and one other house were built to accommodate a limited number of boys. The others lived in boarding-houses run by people who had no connection with the school, apart from one operated by Mr. Birch, one of the masters, and one by Mr. Stanley, the writing master. The life of the boys in these houses

seems to have been quite comfortable, and it is said that during the great Horse Fairs for which Rugby was famous, the boys in the First and Second forms were confined to these houses in order to keep them off the street. Oddly enough the rule apparently did not apply to the School House boys.

Dr. Wooll was also responsible, in 1814, for preparing the way for Arnold by holding service for the boys in the school instead of having them attend service in the parish church. Six years later the school chapel was built and ready for the boys, which again was a happy circumstance for Arnold in that he not only found the custom established of holding the service in the school, but also a fitting place for devotional services.

In 1808 Dr. Wooll asked the trustees for, and received, money to be used for prizes. The two prizes that were instituted were the Latin Poem Prize, for which a ten-guinea book was given, and the English Poem prize, for which a six-guinea book was given. Thus Arnold had a precedent to guide him when he wanted to provide prizes for good work. These awards of Wooll had one curious side effect. It became the custom for the winners of these trophies to each subscribe half-a-guinea to be used to supply beer for all the boys who finished one particular Hare-and-Hounds race, appropriately named the Prize Poem Run. On one of these runs, after the boys had had their beer and were on the way home, some of them caused considerable damage in a plantation owned by a man who had alienated himself from the boys by forbidding them to swim in part of the river that he controlled. The interesting part of the story is that all "the praeposters, four or five,

who were present at the run, gave themselves up as answerable for the misconduct which had taken place."⁴¹ However, this would not suffice, and Wooll requested that the names of all the boys involved should be given to him. The praeposters agreed among themselves that they would not give in the name of any boy who did not wish it, but they would excuse from fagging for the rest of the half-year every fag who volunteered to have his name given in. The youngsters, who flocked for their flogging, obviously considered a beating to be preferable to fagging. The praeposters were not only given long impositions, but were made to go and apologise to the owner of the plantation. If this account can be trusted it would seem that the praeposters were expected to be responsible for the good conduct of the younger boys, and they accepted that responsibility, at least fifteen years before Arnold took over the school.

In 1816, when the numbers of boys at Rugby reached 381, some of whom came from as far away as the West Indies, the school was the second largest in England. Despite the drop in numbers Wooll managed to maintain a high scholastic standard, which is especially commendable as much of the time the school was being rebuilt while the work went on. He had nine assistant masters to help him in his task, including a French master and a writing-master, who also taught arithmetic.⁴² The headmaster not only taught the Sixth Form, he also managed to examine, from time to time, every class in the school. Six additional scholarships at the universities were added during his tenure, bringing the total up to fourteen.

Arnold thought the fees too low at Rugby and was instrumental

in having them raised. Wooll had also had similar ideas twenty years before, and had the fees raised to twenty-five guineas per annum in his first year as headmaster. It was later raised to thirty guineas. Wooll, like Arnold, was concerned with the well-being of his staff and a pension scheme was started in 1824, at which time five of his assistant masters were given substantial increases in their salaries. Not only were the school buildings completely rebuilt during Wooll's tenure, but the school Close was greatly enlarged in 1816, to the extent that eight acres were made available for games. The boys assisted in levelling the cricket ground, and were paid for their labours.⁴³ A choir was started in 1822, the boys being dressed in surplices and paid forty shillings a year for their services. An organ was added to the chapel in 1823 and the following year an organist was appointed for the sum of fifty pounds a year. Two years later Mr. Anstey was made school chaplain, for which he was paid ninety pounds per annum. In 1824 a school hymn-book was published, which is believed to have been the first of its kind in Public Schools. Planning for the school library was also commenced in Wooll's time, although it was not carried out until Arnold's reign. The fact that Wooll actively encouraged theatricals among the boys is indicative of the interest he took in the boys under his care. His wife was on very friendly terms with the pupils and was known by them as "Mother Wooll" because of the motherly interest she took in them, an interest which was probably increased by the fact that she had no children of her own.

There appears to be absolutely no evidence to show that Rugby was a bad school at any time under Wooll. It has been said that

"When it (Rugby) came into his (Arnold's) hands, it was the lowest and most Boeotian of English schools."⁴⁴ The only ostensible reason for such a statement is that the writer wished to make Arnold's achievements greater than they really were, something that Arnold would doubtless never have wanted. In fact Arnold was quite unable to determine the reason for the decline in numbers at the school under Wooll. His reports of the state of the school are good; his comments on Wooll show him to have been favourably impressed. One of the most peaceful and pleasant half years Arnold spent at Rugby was his first, before the influence of Wooll had had time to fade. It is doubtful if the academic successes and careers of Old Rugbeians were any better in Arnold's time than they had been in Wooll's.⁴⁵

Wooll had a reputation as a flogger, but so had Arnold, and it is doubtful if Wooll was any more severe in this respect than most of his contemporaries. In twenty years of rule, while rebellions were commonplace, Wooll had to cope with only two comparatively minor infractions of that nature. On his death, William Macready, the actor whose career Wooll had followed with interest, is reported as saying:

The news which letters conveyed to me this morning from the papers, was the death of my old master, Dr. Wooll. I really regret him; he was kind, most hospitable, ready to enjoy and delighted to look upon enjoyment; in short, of a most benevolent disposition. He had little or no pretensions to profound learning, but he was a thoroughly good-natured, kind-hearted man.⁴⁶

Macready was not alone in his respect for Wooll. This was one of the problems that Arnold had to face, in that when he wanted to change things, or simply when he was different from Wooll, the Old Rugbeians who had been under the older man reacted against him. "Those taught under the old man were intensely loyal to him, and the different,

positive qualities of Arnold became matters of suspicion in the older generation."⁴⁷

Wooll, then, was a good and successful headmaster by all the criteria usually applied in such cases. The school, when he relinquished the reins in favour of Arnold, was in no way inferior to other schools of the time, except for numbers. In fact, however, the smallness of the student body may well have been a positive factor. It meant that the teacher/pupil ratio was good and there was less chance and likelihood of the worst kind of excesses.⁴⁸ Dr. Wooll has suffered at the hands of historians partly because of the inevitable comparisons with Samuel Butler and still more by the fact that writers have been concerned with demonstrating Arnold's greatness. Football and cricket were popular, at least among the older boys, and the juniors were accustomed to crowding the goalmouth in the football games and acting as fielders for the older boys when they practised their cricket. The emphasis on these two games was not great and the Barbarian pursuits were probably more popular than either football or cricket. The Philistine influence had not yet made any great changes in the boys' pastimes.

NOTES

¹ John Moutrie, "The Dream of Life," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, Vol. XCI, No: DLIX, May, 1862. Quoted in an essay entitled: "A Visit to Rugby."

² "His name may be spelt according to the fancy of the speller," says H. A. Newton, "A Rugby Ramble," The English Illustrated Magazine, August 1888, Vol. 5, p. 719. The name can be seen spelled: Lawrence Sheriffe, Sheriff, Shreffe, Sherif, Shrefe, Shyryfe, or Laurence Sherriffe.

The major work used in preparing this chapter is, W. H. D. Rouse, A History of Rugby School (London: Duckworth & Co., 1898), but others, such as Nicholas Harris Nicolas The History of the Town and School of Rugby (Coventry: Merridew and Son, 1826), W. H. D. Rouse, "Rugby School," Public School Magazine, May, 1898; Anon, "A Visit to Rugby," op. cit., R. B. Pugh, ed., A History of the County of Warwick, Vol. II (London: Oxford University Press) etc., have been utilised to substantiate, corroborate or add to the outline here given. Reference is not made to the source except when there are discrepancies, or a direct quote is used, in the main. The two works by Rouse are distinguished as: Rouse, History; and Rouse, Rugby.

³ Rouse, Rugby, op. cit., p. 385.

⁴ There is a counter-claim from Brownsover for the honour of being Sherriffe's birthplace. Brownsover is a small village a short way from Rugby.

⁵ Newton, op. cit., p. 719.

⁶ See Rouse, Rugby, pp. 385-6 and Newton, op. cit., pp. 719-20 for rather more detailed versions of the story.

⁷ The name is given as "feoffees" rather than "trustees" in the original document.

⁸ Rouse, Rugby, op. cit., p. 386. See also Newton, op. cit., p. 720 and Nicolas, op. cit., p. 103.

⁹ Rouse, Rugby, op. cit., p. 386.

¹⁰ See Newton, op. cit., p. 720.

¹¹ Pugh, op. cit., p. 361.

¹² Ibid., p. 362.

¹³Ibid., p. 361.

¹⁴Intent of Laurence Sherriffe, as reprinted by Nicolas, op. cit., p. 100.

¹⁵Pugh, op. cit., p. 362.

¹⁶It is not known when this started, but only that it was being held by the end of the century.

¹⁷Nicolas, op. cit., p. 108.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 109.

¹⁹Pugh, op. cit., p. 363.

Nicolas, op. cit., p. 113, agrees that the second schoolhouse was finished in 1750, but says that the house given by Sherriffe for the residence of the Schoolmaster was not wholly demolished until 1783.

²⁰Pugh, op. cit., p. 363.

²¹Quoted in John Rodgers, The Old Public Schools of England (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1938), p. 78.

It appears that James found the "becoming occasions" were quite frequent, as he spent, according to Pugh, op. cit., p. 363, two guineas "for Rods or Birch for a year."

²²The chaplain was paid £ 20 per annum for his duties, and this sum was later raised to 30 guineas.

²³Pugh, op. cit., p. 363.

²⁴See W. C. Sargent, "Young England at School: Rugby," Ludgate Monthly, October, 1892, p. 361; Rouse, Rugby, op. cit., p. 388; and T. W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London: The Cresset Press, 1960), p. 21 for comments and descriptions of this rise.

²⁵The Island still exists, but is now simply a tree-covered mound planted with flowers. At the time of the Great Rebellion it was an actual island. The mound being surrounded by a moat. The soldiers surprised the boys by attacking them from the rear. The Island is mentioned in Tom Brown's School-days towards the end of the book, as the vantage point on which Tom Brown, Arthur and the young master are standing to watch the cricket match. It used to be the

custom to "dress" the Island on Speech Day, and the juniors were sent off to "acquire" in any way they could, tools and flowers. The local residents must have seen their prize flowers decorating the Island many times.

²⁶ Son of John Wooll of Winchester. Balliol College, Oxford: matriculated January 17, 1785, aged 17; B. A. from New College, 1790; M. A. 1794; B. D. and D. D. 1807; Rector of Blackford, Somerset, 1796; Master of Midhurst Free Grammar School, 1799-1806; Headmaster Rugby, 1807-1828; died November 23, 1833.

²⁷ The criticism that was levelled at the Public Schools in the early part of the nineteenth century is a matter of record. Almost any text referring to the Public Schools of that period mentions their state and the reaction it caused. For example, see: H. C. Barnard, A Short History of English Education from 1760 to 1944 (London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1949), pp. 14-23; Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education 1780-1870 (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1964), pp. 98-102; E. C. Mack, Public Schools and British Opinion, 1780-1860 (London: Methuen, 1930), pp. 143-169; David Newsome, Godliness and Good Learning (London: John Murray, 1961), pp. 3-5, etc., the list could be extended almost indefinitely. Further, the many articles, letters to the press, etc., which were written at the time, such as Smith's article cited above, are readily available. Histories of individual schools, such as J. D'E Firth, Winchester College (Winchester: P. & G. Wells Ltd., 1944), Chapter IV, passim, almost invariably have to admit that the particular school was part of the common lot and subject to the same criticism. Of all the books that cover this period and refer to the Public Schools in general, E. C. Mack's is one of the best and is virtually indispensable to any student of this era of Public School education.

²⁸ Bamford discusses this problem at some length in T. W. Bamford, The Rise of the Public Schools (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1967), Chapter I, passim, but is unable to do more than suggest possible reasons. "Explanations for the facts of insecurity and the common decline are not easy to find. Each school has plausible reasons for its own success or failure, but against the combined national picture they invariably fail." Ibid., p. 4.

²⁹ The Author of Etonia, The Public Schools: Winchester - Westminster - Shrewsbury - Harrow - Rugby (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1867), p. 376.

³⁰ Ibid. The author quotes a pupil and friend of Wooll but gives no further identification.

³¹ See T. W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London: The Cresset Press, 1960), pp. 83-4, for example.

³² These incidents are reported in a number of works, but for the present purposes the author of Etonia's work, op. cit., has provided the details.

³³ Ibid., pp. 380-1. The author quotes "one of the culprits" with no other details.

³⁴ In reading accounts of the schools at this period one is struck by the fact that people state that reforms were carried out in their time; that when they first arrived at the school things were very bad but by the time that they left everything had improved. Obviously these men are not being untruthful, and yet one finds accounts of others who went to the same school at a later date giving similar descriptions, i. e., of bad conditions which improved by the time they left, and of abuses which earlier writers have stated were no longer in evidence. The answer would seem to be that as boys moved up the school they ceased to be the objects of cruelty and bullying and therefore genuinely thought that such behaviour had stopped. This effect would be heightened by the fact that the older boys became authority figures to the younger so that boys who were being bullied would not tell those of the older boys who might have helped them. Some of the boy/master relationship would undoubtedly be felt by a small boy in regard to a Sixth Former. N. B. This is not an original observation. The present writer had the point brought to his notice by Bamford, op. cit., Rise, p. 79.

³⁵ The substitution of "guttles" is noted by Rouse, Rugby, op. cit., p. 399.

³⁶ Mathew Holbeche Bloxam, Rugby, the School and Neighbourhood Ed. by the Rev. W. H. Payne Smith, (London: Whittaker & Co., 1889), p. 72. Bloxam says that if the boys were caught cooking their delicacies the food was appropriated and sent to the almsmen, who were also beneficiaries of Laurence Sherriffe.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 71.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 72.

³⁹ Rouse, History, op. cit., p. 214, records that a battle between three of the Rugby boys and three lads from the town ended suddenly when the cry, "Wooll's coming!" was heard. It would appear, then, that Wooll was not in favour of fighting.

⁴⁰ Bloxam, op. cit., p. 73.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 88-9.

⁴²Arnold Whitridge, Dr. Arnold of Rugby (London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1928), p. 86.

⁴³Rouse, op. cit., p. 198.

⁴⁴Anon, "Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold," Edinburgh Review, January, 1845, p. 228.

⁴⁵Rouse, History, op. cit., pp. 208-210, gives a brief account of some of the successes of Wooll's Old Boys. Among them, he notes, were sixteen Fellows of various colleges at the two universities, one Senior Wrangler, one Ireland scholar, one Craven scholar at Cambridge, one Chancellor's medallist, and four Bell scholars. A university prize for Latin verse was won four times and for Latin essay twice. There was also one Newdigate prizeman and two Members' prizemen among the group. Some of his pupils became renowned as statesmen, including a Secretary of State for Ireland, a Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, a Lord of the Treasury and Chief Secretary for Ireland, a Minister Plenipotentiary for Florence and Turin as well as a man who was Solicitor-General, Attorney-General and Lord Chancellor. There were men who became famous as scholars and antiquarians, physicians, divines and at least one as a naturalist, as well as many who entered the services and served with distinction. Rouse gives names and details of this imposing array of talent.

⁴⁶Bloxam, op. cit., p. 114. The quotation is taken from Macready's reminiscences.

⁴⁷Bamford, Arnold, op. cit., p. 83.

⁴⁸Bamford, ibid., stresses the excellence of Rugby at the time that Arnold arrived. See pp. 25-6.



RUGBY SCHOOL.
(STREET VIEW)



ENTRANCE TO THE HALL, AND PART OF THE QUADRANGLE
RUGBY SCHOOL.



JACOBY SCHOOL



SCHOOL HOUSE,
(EAST VIEW)

CHAPTER V

ARNOLD AND RUGBY SCHOOL

We have, in the most perfect degree, that visible representation of all the functions of a state, . . . the schoolhouse, the chapel, and the playground, forming as they do one united group, become a tangible focus, in which the whole of our school existence is, as it were, symbolically consecrated.

Rugby Magazine
October, 1835,
Vol. I, No: 2,
p. 96.

With regard to reforms at Rugby, give me credit, I must beg of you, for a most sincere desire to make it a place of Christian education. At the same time my object will be, if possible, to form Christian men, for Christian boys I can scarcely hope to make; . . . ¹

It was with thoughts such as these that Thomas Arnold went to Rugby in August, 1828. He was anxious to discover whether "our system of public schools has not in it some noble elements which, under the blessing of the Spirit of all holiness and wisdom, might produce fruit even to life eternal." ² His optimism was tempered with the belief that the public schools were, in the words of J. Bowdler, "the very seats and nurseries of vice," ³ and that this perfect vileness could be only partially remedied. ⁴ Nevertheless, he believed that a great deal could be done and, in fact, said that he would not undertake the business if he did not have that belief. ⁵ "My views of things," he said, just before going to Rugby, "certainly become daily more reforming; . . ." ⁶ Despite being favourably impressed by the school he still felt that there was a great deal that needed to be changed:

Our impressions of the exterior of every thing that we saw during our visit to Dr. Wooll in January, were very favourable; at the same time that (*sic*) I anticipate a great many difficulties in the management of affairs, before they can be brought into good train. ⁷

He commenced working on these difficulties even before he took up office.

The visit to Rugby impressed upon Arnold the need to come to a decision regarding his ordination. It was apparent that it would be advantageous for him to be able to administer the Sacrament, and if he were anxious to establish an education based on religion then it would be intolerable for one of his assistants to be his superior in the field

of religion. Arnold took his quandary to the Bishop of London, explaining his doubts about subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles. The Bishop convinced him to put aside his scruples, so on June 1, 1828 he became a priest and before the end of November he took his Doctor of Divinity degree and became Dr. Arnold.

His new status as a divine gave Arnold the additional authority he required to make Rugby a centre of Christian education. In this work Arnold was showing himself to be very much a product of his times. This was the period of "godliness and good learning"⁸ when religion and education were seen as one, and Arnold was to become one of the most notable apostles of the creed. It was not only in his desire to make the boys of Rugby into Christian men that Arnold expressed views which were in accordance with the spirit of the times. In all the changes he made at Rugby it is possible to see societal values finding practical expression. In some instances Arnold was ahead of the times, as he was in his religious thinking, and reforms he brought about were not accepted as being beneficial until some time after they had been put into effect. This is seen most clearly in his use of the praepositorial system, for which he was at first bitterly attacked but which was adopted by almost every school that laid claim to the status of a Public School after his death.⁹

Arnold's influence at Rugby had a "civilising" effect in that he changed the school from a Barbarian institution to one in which Philistine values predominated.¹⁰ This change paralleled the one which was taking place in society as a whole, and which is exemplified in the sports and games the people played. The school provided a microcosm

of early Victorian society as the country moved from its state as an agrarian country ruled by an aristocracy to an industrial nation governed by the middle classes.

This microcosmic role of Rugby school, and of Arnold, is of great importance as far as the growth of games¹¹ is concerned, because the increased stress that was placed on games throughout the century, the belief that character could be built by participating in games, and the undue veneration that was paid to the athlete, to the point where intellectual prowess was downgraded by comparison,¹² are all symptoms of the state of society as a whole. Arnold, as a man, typified much that was common within the society; Rugby school, as a small community, demonstrated a number of the changes that were occurring in England at the time. Thus it is that reforms that were made at Rugby which had no obvious connection with games, were important to their development because of the different ethos that these changes helped to create, and of which they were expressions. Stanley expresses this microcosmic role of the school when he says:

...this our world with its inhabitants ... is for a time our country and commonwealth, of which each member of the school is a citizen and in which, as we have often thought, all the chief workings of society might be advantageously viewed as in the Kingdoms of Lilliput or Laputa¹³

Outside the school the reformers were introducing new concepts which were changing the country's values from Barbarian to Philistine, whereby much of the harshness and severity was disappearing and the government was adopting a more paternalistic role. Within the school the same kinds of change were being made, and the net result was the creation of a more civilised atmosphere in which religion flourished

and the country pursuits of the gentry, hunting, fishing and shooting, were replaced by the middle-class type of game with rules and boundaries. It is in the creation of this ethos that such reforms as giving each boy a separate bed, can be seen to have helped the movement from Barbarian to Philistine activities. The change shows, for instance, a paternalistic concern which had been lacking in the Public Schools hitherto. Arnold's new, paternalistic outlook was probably engendered by his work at Laleham, but was also typical of the Victorians, especially later in the century, and was entirely compatible with an increased interest in organised games, where the boys were together, within sight and, therefore, subject to supervision, however slight that might be.

Seen in the light of the creation of an ethos in which games could flourish, other reforms that Arnold carried out can be seen to have had a greater effect on their development than is otherwise apparent. For instance, Arnold governed his school through his praeposters. Each member of the Sixth Form was, ipso facto, a praeposter, or prefect. He had the legal right to fag boys below the Fifth Form and to inflict corporal punishment on those who transgressed from the rules. Arnold placed implicit trust in his praeposters and went to any lengths to support them in the lawful execution of their duties. His reliance upon them was so great that he said that without this confidence in them he would be forced to resign.¹⁴ Praeposters were not new in the Public Schools, nor at Rugby, but Arnold's method of trusting them and giving them responsibilities in return for privileges was a novel idea. Hitherto the prefects in the schools had

enjoyed a number of privileges, including fagging and flogging, but had done nothing in exchange for these privileges. Further, many of the older, stronger boys had, without any official sanction, adopted the same rights. Arnold attempted to legalise and regularise the whole procedure, keeping the privileges, and the control of the boys, in the hands of those who had won their way to the top of the school by ability, rather than by brute strength.

Arnold discusses at some length his views on the use of prefects and fagging in an article that was first published in the Quarterly Journal of Education in 1835 and in which he stresses that the power to fag must be a legal one:

Now by "the power of fagging," I understand a power given by the supreme authorities of a school to the boys of the highest class or classes in it, to be exercised by them over the lower boys for the sake of securing the advantages of regular government amongst the boys themselves, and avoiding the evils of anarchy, --in other words, of the lawless tyranny of physical strength.¹⁵

Arnold's ideas on the prefectorial system were fixed before he came to Rugby and remained so throughout his life.¹⁶ It can be readily seen that such a system would transfer easily to the games field, so that boys who were accustomed to obeying senior pupils during school hours would be unlikely to object to a similar situation in their leisure time.

Arnold's views on the place of the Sixth Form in the school are important in that they formed a central tenet of his educational theories. As such, they demonstrate very clearly the kind of school he was attempting to create and the type of person he was trying to develop. The praeposters were directly responsible to the headmaster and it was through this elite corps that Arnold expected to make Rugby a

place of Christian education. These young men and boys, aged from about sixteen to nineteen, were given a grave responsibility, as Arnold recognised:

Speaking to you, as young men who can enter into what I say, I wish you to feel that you have another duty to perform, holding the situation that you do in the school; of the importance of this I wish you all to feel sensible, and of the enormous influence you possess, in ways in which we cannot, for good or for evil, on all below you; and I wish you to see fully how many and great are the opportunities offered to you here of doing good--good, too, of lasting benefit to yourselves as well as to others; there is no place, where you will find better opportunities for some time to come, and you will then have reason to look back to your life here with the greatest pleasure... . The state of the school is a subject of congratulation to us all, but only so far as to encourage us to increased exertions;¹⁷

It is clear that he thought the Sixth Form would be a force for good within the school and that these older boys would mature, and thereby benefit from the responsibility they were given.

Arnold ensured that he had a very close relationship with the Sixth Form. He not only taught them and invited them to his house but also held frequent meetings with them, similar to those he held with the assistant masters, to discuss school business. The boys were encouraged to speak their mind plainly and Arnold was never slow to accept advice from them.¹⁸ There is no doubt that when the members of the Sixth were the natural leaders of the school the system worked well. However, it is equally certain that when the Sixth was comprised of younger boys who had reached the top form solely because of their intellectual ability, and were not the natural leaders, then the system faltered.¹⁹

The prefectorial system was adopted by many schools in the period following Arnold's tenure at Rugby, and is still a feature of the

Public Schools, and, indeed, of many other schools which have imitated the Public Schools. It has been said that it was this legalising of self-government by the boys that prepared the ground for the growth of organised games, and it certainly must have made their development much easier than it would otherwise have been.²⁰ The senior boys had, from time immemorial, pressed into service those younger boys that they needed to chase cricket balls for them, as cricket nets had not yet been devised, or to pack the goals in the games of football, or to chase fives balls when they rebounded from the wall in such a way that the player could not reach them. Making fagging legal and giving praepostors the power to administer corporal punishment made this kind of service a recognised part of school life.

There is something fine in Arnold's confidence in the Sixth Form, which he retained to the end of his life, despite many examples of his confidence being misplaced. At the same time it is obvious that the Sixth Form was a blind-spot as far as Arnold was concerned. In most things Arnold was very practical, but he never seemed to realise that by expelling many of the boys who were the natural leaders and by substituting boys without the same leadership qualities he was creating a situation that was unlikely to work well. An example of his blindness to the faults of the praepostors is well demonstrated by an incident, which occurred within two years of his death. Thomas Hughes, as Captain of Football, had control of certain moneys which were traditionally used for a party which was restricted to the older boys. Arnold refused to sanction the party, saying that it was unfair that money given by the total school body should be used in this way for just a few boys. Despite the

headmaster's injunction, Hughes allowed himself to be persuaded by the other boys to hold the affair; there was a considerable amount of drinking and quite a lot of damage done. Hughes left the school the next day without Arnold knowing that he had been involved, but later his conscience got the better of him and he wrote to Arnold explaining his part in the incident. Arnold replied to Hughes' letter from Fox How on December 18, 1840:

My dear Hughes,

I did not know nor should I probably ever have known of your share in the business of Friday last had it not been for your own letter. Officially, therefore, I do not know it now--for of course it would be utterly out of the question to use your own letter as evidence against you. The matter therefore being set at rest so far as any public notice of your conduct is concerned, I have the less difficulty in writing to you fully and plainly, not as Master of Rugby School, but as an old acquaintance of your father's, and as a man who feels very sincerely interested about yourself. I cannot deny that your letter gave me a very great and unexpected shock; for I had no notion that you or anyone else in the Sixth Form was concerned with the party. I have been so accustomed on these points to feel confidence in the Sixth Form, that I really am apt to have no suspicion whatever of them in such matters; and I am quite sure that if I am obliged to resign this confidence the School must speedily go to ruin. Further, I think that according to my school recollections, good and steady fellows at Winchester would have taken no part in such a business, and it would grieve me very much to think that at Rugby such characters could not equally be depended upon--that companionship or any other motives might lead into mischief those on whom I ought to be able to rely.²¹

It is rather sad to see Arnold, after twelve years at Rugby, still being disappointed in his Sixth Form, but it demonstrates a lack of perception and understanding of the boy-mind. Arnold was asking of his praepostors a standard which many adults would find difficult to maintain, especially in a closed community like a boarding-school where group pressures are so very strong. Empathy was never one of Arnold's characteristics; and his belief in the Sixth Formers is a prime example of this lack, which also helps to substantiate the idea

that he never really understood children, or even young men.²²

In some ways, despite expecting too much from his pupils, Arnold had a very good grasp of boy nature. His outlook was extremely pessimistic by today's standards, but the effect his sermons and his teaching had on the boys shows that he was able to reach many of them on some levels. His sermons are filled with his despair of the evil nature of young boys, and it also occurs frequently in his letters. In one letter he says: "...in the nakedness of boy-nature, one is quite able to understand how there could not be found so many as even ten righteous in a whole city."²³ On another occasion he says, "with boys of the richer classes one sees nothing but plenty, health and youth; and these are really awful to behold when one must feel that they are unblest."²⁴ Most of the time, however, his despair is leavened with the optimism that enabled him to carry on trying to create Christian gentlemen, for this was his main aim.

On one occasion a number of boys were caught fishing in waters which they considered they should be allowed to use. The keeper saw the boys, but in attempting to apprehend them fell into the river. The landowner, a Mr. Boughton Leigh, stormed up to the school and demanded retribution. Arnold appealed to the Sixth Form for the names of the boys, but the Sixth either could not, or would not tell him, so an identity parade was held, at which the keeper picked out six of the seven culprits, who were then expelled.²⁵ The expulsions, combined with the loss of their fishing rights, caused a great state of unrest in the school, to the extent that a full-scale rebellion was imminent. At this point Arnold's work with the Sixth Form bore

remarkable fruit, for three of his praepostors, Stanley, Vaughan and Lake, spoke to the boys and managed to calm them down and avert what might have been a very serious incident. Arnold assembled the school and made a speech which has been quoted many times because it is so very typical of the man:

It is not necessary that this should be a school of three hundred, or one hundred, or of fifty boys; but it is necessary that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen.²⁶

Within those few words Arnold states two of his main principles, that expulsion, even mass expulsion, would be used if necessary, and that the main duty of a school was to produce Christian gentlemen.

In order to effect more easily his plans to make Rugby a place of Christian education, Arnold applied for the position of school chaplain. His desire to take on this added duty demonstrates his view that a schoolmaster is in loco parentis.²⁷ In his application Arnold says:

Whoever is chaplain, I must ever feel myself, as Headmaster, the real and proper religious instructor of the boys. No one else can feel the same interest in them, and no one else (I am not speaking of myself personally, but merely by virtue of my situation) can speak to them with so much influence. In fact, it seems to me the natural and fitting thing, and the great advantage of having a separate chapel for the school--that the master of the boys should be officially as well as really their pastor, and that he should not devolve on another, however well qualified, one of his own most peculiar and solemn duties.²⁸

Believing that this was part of his duties Arnold devoted the stipend that went with the chaplaincy to the establishment of a school library.

In order to ensure that the school retained its Christian character, Arnold was prepared to expel any boy whom he considered to be "unpromising." He expresses his belief in this part of his system quite often.

Till a man learns that the first, second, and third duty of a

schoolmaster is to get rid of unpromising subjects, a great public school will never be what it might be, and what it ought to be.²⁹

This idea was also an innovation. Previously it had been considered that expulsion was a final resort for the gravest of crimes, such as rebellion. Arnold, however, introduced a form of superannuation which was not intended as a punishment, but was simply a method by which it was possible to remove those boys who were incapable of benefiting from the school, or who were influencing adversely the other boys. Often Arnold would allow the boy to stay until the end of the half-year and then he would leave with the other boys and just not return at the start of the following session. Many parents complained, but often it was found that the boys who were thus sent away were much better off with a private tutor. Arnold wrote a number of letters to the heads of colleges, private tutors and men in similar positions, recommending that they accept boys whom he had found it necessary to remove.³⁰ His sentiments regarding both the praepostors and the removal of boys when necessary are summed up in a letter he wrote to one of his assistant masters. The letter is undated, but there is no doubt that he would have endorsed what he wrote at any time during his Rugby career. First he says that he is not prepared to justify himself or the school against attacks in the press on "the thickness of Praepostors' sticks, or the greater or less blackness of a boy's bruises," and continues that his ideas were fixed before he came to Rugby on these two subjects:

... that the authority of the Sixth Form is essential to the good of the school, and is to be upheld through all obstacles from within and from without, and that sending away boys is a necessary and regular part of a good system, not as a punishment to one, but as a protection to others.³¹

The boys he singled out for this form of discipline were often the natural leaders and were probably doing more good than Arnold realised. By removing these boys he emasculated the top of the school and left boys who were often too young and lacked the necessary qualities of leadership to replace those Arnold superannuated. It was, in fact, often the games player who was removed, because of Arnold's fear of the influence of boys whose reputation rested on their physical prowess. In a letter to the head of a college, regarding one such boy, he says of him that he

...was not a bad fellow at all, but had overgrown school in his body before he had outgrown it in wit; he was therefore the hero of the younger boys for his strength and prowess; and that this sort of distinction was doing him harm, so that I advised his father to take him away, and to get him entered at the University as soon as possible.³²

The fact that Arnold included George Hughes, the elder brother of Thomas Hughes, who was an excellent athlete, among those he asked to leave, shows that his criteria were not those that would have been used a decade or so later.

The normal method of punishing boys in schools was flogging. Arnold considered flogging necessary as an ultimate weapon, especially for the younger boys. He instituted a sliding scale of punishments, whereby he tried talking to the boys first and gradually introducing sterner measures. He believed that one should not use the ultimate weapon too soon, leaving nothing in reserve if it were not effective. He considered that flogging was an appropriate mode of punishment for younger boys, as a last resort, but thought that it should be used less and less as the boys progressed up the school. For the younger boys, he retained flogging for moral offences, such as lying, drinking and

habitual idleness.³³

Arnold's stated reasons for reducing the amount of flogging are related solely to discipline;³⁴ he saw the futility of using the punishment indiscriminately so that it lost any power that it might have had.³⁵ He did not admit to being influenced by the prevailing tide of public opinion that was against flogging in schools and which was causing a reduction in the severity of the punishments meted out to criminals. Nevertheless, there was a diminution of harshness in the discipline of the school,³⁶ which contributed to the general tone of the school. It is possible that a reduction of brutality in one sphere of school life would be carried over into other aspects and that a more civilised atmosphere would prevail. In the games the boys played, especially football, such a change can be seen. The rules gradually become more explicit and forbid the rougher aspects of the game; the numbers of players are reduced and skill begins to be more important than brute strength.³⁷

In his attempts to reduce flogging, Arnold seems to have met with some success, but he still acquired the reputation of being a man who flogged unmercifully. This was largely due to one incident, which serves to give an insight into his character, in that it shows his abhorrence of lying and his moral courage. As was his custom, Arnold was engaged in examining one of the forms when a boy, named March, explained that he was unable to construe a certain passage because that part of the book had yet to be reached. Arnold checked the list that had been given him by the form master, Mr. Bird, and found that the passage was included. March insisted that he was right, so Arnold checked with Mr. Bird who said March was wrong.

The boy still insisted he was right. These protestations in the face of seemingly irrefutable evidence enraged Arnold and he proceeded to thrash March, giving him eighteen strokes in all. Afterwards Arnold discovered that Bird had made the mistake and the boy had, therefore, been punished unfairly. Arnold, very contrite, apologised to the boy, expressed his sorrow to the class and even apologised to March in front of the whole school.

The incident was seized upon by the press and Arnold became the centre of a public controversy that lasted for weeks. The result was that he was branded as a merciless flogger, which is ironical considering his views on the subject and his attempts to lessen the amount of flogging in the school.³⁸

The March incident was unfortunate, and certainly does not show Arnold in any good light, apart from his moral courage and integrity in facing the whole school and admitting his mistake and apologising to the boy. The episode tends to detract from his image as a reformer and a Christian gentleman. However, lying, for Arnold, was one of the worst possible sins. He put great trust in a boy's word, but if that trust were betrayed, he punished the offender severely. Stanley makes this point quite clearly, and then goes on to say:

Even with the lower forms he never seemed to be on the watch for boys; and in the higher forms any attempt at further proof of an assertion was immediately checked:--"If you say so, that is quite enough--of course I believe your word"; and there grew up in consequence a general feeling that "it was a shame to tell Arnold a lie--he always believes one."³⁹

It was a heinous crime that March had, apparently, committed, which explains, if it does not excuse, Arnold's conduct.

On the whole, however, it appears that Arnold's reforming zeal did reduce the amount of lying among the boys, and the flogging. In other areas there is more doubt as to his effectiveness as a reformer. One of the major points of attack by critics of the Public Schools was the classical curriculum. It was seen as being outmoded and of very little use to boys who were going to become manufacturers, or anything else, other than schoolmasters. Arnold was one of the most radical and liberal headmasters of a Public School in his day and it would, therefore, be expected that if anyone would reform the curriculum it would be he. Arnold, however, was a great believer in the virtues of the classics:

The study of language seems to me as if it was given for the very purpose of forming the human mind in youth; and the Greek and Latin languages in themselves so perfect, and at the same time freed from the insuperable difficulty which must attend any attempt to teach boys philology through the medium of their own spoken language seem the very instruments, by which this is to be effected.⁴⁰

Arnold found the classical curriculum established and he retained it, as he did most of the institutions he inherited. However, in this as in almost every other aspect of the school, he retained the appearance but changed much that went on under the name of classics. For Arnold the classical languages were living; the men who wrote were almost like his contemporaries. "But the mind of the Greek and of the Roman is in all the essential points of its constitution our own; and not only so, but it is our mind developed to an extraordinary degree of perfection."⁴¹

"Every lesson in Greek or Latin may, and ought to be made a lesson in English; the translation of every sentence in Demosthenes

or Tacitus is properly an exercise in extemporaneous English composition," says Arnold in his article. He advocates translating, as opposed to construing, and translating into a comparable idiom.

In the choice of his words, and in the style of his sentences, he (a pupil) should be taught to follow the analogy required by the age and character of the writer whom he is translating. For instance, in translating Homer, hardly any words should be employed except Saxon, and the oldest and simplest of those which are of French origin; and the language should consist of a series of simple propositions, connected with one another by the most inartificial conjunctions.⁴²

Reading the classics need not be a sterile exercise, but could be used to learn more about humanity and more about modern man than any other method.

Arnold tried, successfully as far as one can judge, to break away from the practice of keeping subjects self-contained. Thus a lesson in Greek was a lesson in English and a lesson in history, both ancient and modern, a lesson in literature and a lesson in philology. Probably economics, politics and social problems would be part of the same lesson. Periods in the day were set aside for Language, Scripture, History, Mathematics, French and so on, but the scope of any particular lesson was intended to be much wider than was common at the time. Again, the need for highly skilled, well-read, up-to-date teachers can be seen to be essential if such a programme were to be successfully carried out.

Arnold was a man of diverse interests himself and tried to encourage his pupils to be likewise. He set essay topics which forced the boys to read widely⁴³ while his discussions and teaching were designed to arouse the interests of different boys on different subjects.

	CLASSICAL DIVISION.			MATHEMATICAL DIVISION.	FRENCH DIVISION.
	Language Time.	Scriptural Instruction, &c.	History Time.		
FIRST FORM	Latin Grammar, and Latin Delectus.	Church Catechism and Abridgment of New Testament History.	Markham's England, Vol. I.	Tables, Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, and Division, simple and compound Reduction.	Hamel's Exercises up to the Auxiliary Verb.
SECOND FORM	Latin Grammar and Latin Delectus. Eutropius.	St. Luke. Genesis.	Markham's England, Vol. II.	The work done in the first form repeated; Rule of Three, Practice.	Hamel's Exercises, Auxiliary Verbs, regular Conjugations, and some of the irregular. Gaultier's Geography.
THIRD FORM	Greek Grammar (Matthiæ Abridgement). Valpy's Greek Exercises. Valpy's Greek Delectus. Florilegium. Translations into Latin.	Exodus, Numbers, Judges, I. and II. Samuel, St. Matthew.	Eutropius. Physical Geography, U.K.S.	Rule of Three. Practice. Vulgar Fractions. Interest.	Hamel's Exercises, first part continued, Irregular Verbs. Elizabeth, ou Les Exilés in Sibérie.

	CLASSICAL DIVISION.			MATHEMATICAL DIVISION.	FRENCH DIVISION.
	Language Time.	Scriptural Instruction, &c.	History Time.		
LOWER REMOVE	Greek Grammar, and Valpy's Exercises. Rules of the Greek Iambics. Easy Parts of the Iambics of the Greek Tragedians. Virgil's Eclogues. Cicero de Senectute.	St. Matthew in Greek Testament. Acts in the English Bible.	Parts of Justin. Parts of Xenophon's Anabasis. Markham's France to Philip of Valois.	Vulgar Fractions. Interest. Decimal Fractions. Square Root.	Hamel continued and repeated. Jussieu's Jardin des Plantes.
FOURTH FORM	Æschylus Prometheus. Virgil, Æn. II. and III. Cicero de Amicitia.	Acts in the Greek Testament. St. John in the English Bible. Old Testament History.	Part of Xenophon's Hellenics. Florus, from III. 21. to IV. 11. History of Greece, U.K.S. Markham's France, from Philip of Valois. Detailed Geography of Italy and Germany.	Decimals, Involution and Evolution, Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, and Division of Algebra. Binomial Theorem. Euclid, Book I., Propos. I. to XV.	Hamel's 2nd Part, chiefly Syntax of the Pronouns. La Fontaine's Fables.
UPPER REMOVE	Sophocles' Philoct. Æschyl. Eumenid. Homer's Iliad, I. II. Virgil Æn., IV. V. Parts of Horace, Odes I. II. III. Parts of Cicero's Epistles.	St. John in Greek Testament. Deuteronomy and Ep. of St. Peter. Selections from the Psalms.	Parts of Arrian. Parts of Paternulus, Book II. Sir J. Macintosh's England.	Equation of Payments, Discount, Simple Equations. Euclid, Book I. from XV. to end.	Translations from English into French. La Fontaine's Fables.

	CLASSICAL DIVISION.			MATHEMATICAL DIVISION.	FRENCH DIVISION.
	Language Time.	Scriptural Instruction, &c.	History Time.		
LOWER FIFTH	Æschyl. Sept. contra Thebas. Sophocl. Œd. Tyr. Homer's Iliad, III. IV. Virgil's Æn., VI. VII. Extracts from Cicero's Epistles. Parts of Horace.	St. John. Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Bible History, from 1 Kings to Nehemiah, inclusive.	Parts of Arrian. Herodotus III., 1, 33, 61, 67, 88, 116. Livy, Parts of II. and III., Hallam's Middle Ages, France, Spain, Greeks, and Saracens. Physical and Political Geography of all Europe.	Exchange, Alligation, Simple Equations, with two unknown Quantities and Problems. Euclid, Book III.	Syntax and Idioms. A Play of Molière, to construe and then turn again from English into French.
FIFTH FORM	Æschyl. Agamemnon. Homer's Iliad, V. VI. Odyssey, IX. Demosthenes' Leptines in Aphobum. I. Virgil's Æn., VIII. Parts of Horace. Cicero in Verrem.	Epistles to the Corinthians. Paley's Horæ Pauline.	Parts of Herodotus and Thucydides. Parts of Livy. Hallam's Middle Ages. State of Society.	Quadratic Equations. Trigonometry. Euclid, to the end of Book VI.	Pensées de Pascal. Translations from English into French.
SIXTH FORM	Various parts of Virgil and Homer. Some one or more of the Greek Tragedies. One or more of the private Orations of Demosthenes. Cicero against Verres. Part of Aristotle's Ethics.	One of the Prophets in the Septuagint Version. Different Parts of the New Testament.	Parts of Thucydides, and Arrian. Parts of Tacitus. Parts of Russell's Modern Europe.	Euclid, III.—VI. Simple and Quadratic Equations, Plane Trigonometry, Conic Sections.	Parts of Guizot's Histoire de la Révolution de l'Angleterre, and Mignet's Histoire de la Révolution de la France.

RUGBY SCHOOL'S CURRICULUM DURING ARNOLD'S TENURE

His own major interests were history and geography, which were virtually one as far as he was concerned. History, he felt, could not be understood unless the local geography and topography were known. This was especially true in the realm of military history, and he spent many a holiday on the Continent tracing the routes taken by armies of the past, trying to determine which pass Hannibal must have used over the Alps, familiarising himself with the terrain of the sites of the great battles of former years and, in general, increasing his knowledge of history. His own love of history and geography had been stimulated when he was a child on the Isle of Wight, and he was sorry for his Rugby boys, many of whom had never travelled far enough to visit the sea.

More than half my boys never saw the sea, and never were in London, and it is surprising how the first of these disadvantages interferes with their understanding much of the ancient poetry, while the other keeps the range of their ideas in an exceedingly narrow compass. Brought up myself in the Isle of Wight, amidst the bustle of soldiers and sailors, and familiar from a child with boats and ships, and the flags of half Europe, which gave me an instinctive acquaintance with geography, I quite marvel to find in what a state of ignorance boys are at seventeen or eighteen, who have lived all their days in inland country parishes or small country towns.⁴⁴

Conflicting claims have been made for Arnold in almost everything he did, and the curriculum is no exception. On the one hand, it has been said: "In terms of the curriculum, he was very orthodox, and it would be ludicrous to make claims for him as a reformer."⁴⁵ On the other hand, it has been stated: "Such was Arnold's new curriculum and time-table, and if it seems modest by comparison with that of today it was broader by far than anything known as yet."⁴⁶ The truth lies somewhere between these views and, in a sense, incorporates both.

The actual course outline was not very different from that of any other public school of the period, so he was not a great innovator in that sense; but the approach he used to teach the established curriculum was new, and in that sense he could claim to be a reformer. The changes he made, the subjects he introduced and even the approach were not unique, but they were different from the rest of the public schools, (as opposed to other types of schools) and, taken together to form a system, were substantially different from almost any other school. Stanley certainly states that his curriculum was innovative:

He was the first Englishman who drew attention in our public schools to the historical, political, and philosophical value of philology and of the ancient writers, as distinguished from the mere verbal criticism and elegant scholarship of the last century. And besides the general impulse which he gave to miscellaneous reading, both in the regular examinations and by encouraging the tastes of particular boys for geology or other like pursuits, he incorporated the study of Modern History, Modern Languages, and Mathematics into the work of the school, which attempt, as it was the first of its kind, so it was at one time the chief topic of blame and praise in his system of instruction. The reading of a considerable portion of modern history was effected without difficulty; but the endeavour to teach mathematics and modern languages, especially the latter, not as an optional appendage, but as a regular part of the school business, was beset with obstacles, which rendered his plan less successful than he had anticipated; though his wishes, especially for boys who were unable to reap the full advantage of classical studies were, to a great extent, answered.⁴⁷

However, as far as science is concerned Arnold not only did not include it in his scheme of work, he deliberately excluded it, although his views on the subject are somewhat ambivalent. Basically he believed that if science were to be studied at all, then it should be studied intensively, but to do so would leave a man incompletely educated.

Physical science alone can never make a man educated; even the formal sciences grammar, arithmetic, logic, geometry,

valuable as they are with respect to the discipline of the reasoning powers, cannot instruct the judgment; it is only moral and religious knowledge which can accomplish this.⁴⁸

In a letter to Dr. Greenhill, dated May 9, 1836, Arnold speaks of science and says:

If one might wish for impossibilities, I might then wish that my children might be well versed in physical science, but in due subordination to the fulness and freshness of their knowledge on moral subjects. This, however, I believe cannot be, ... wherefore, rather than have it the principal thing in my son's mind, I would gladly have him think that the sun went round the earth, and that the stars were so many spangles set in the bright blue firmament. Surely the one thing needful for a Christian and an Englishman to study is Christian and moral and political philosophy, ...⁴⁹

Arnold was a man of whom it was said, "He wakes every morning with the impression that every thing is an open question,"⁵⁰ so it would be unlikely that he would retain the same curriculum unchanged for the full fourteen years of his tenure. Nevertheless, he was also a man who worked on general principles⁵¹ and there is no doubt that the curriculum remained substantially the same throughout.

Arnold's general principles extended to his method of teaching. He was not concerned with supplying his pupils with facts, but with teaching them how to learn. "You come here, not to read, but to learn how to read," he said,⁵² and this was a view he repeated often: "It is not so much our object to give 'useful information,' as to facilitate their gaining it hereafter for themselves, and to enable them to turn it to account when gained."⁵³ Hence his method was to teach by questioning and he rarely gave information, other than as a kind of reward for the pupil's own effort.⁵⁴

The central principle of Arnold's life and work was Christianity, and everything he said or did, privately or publicly, was part of this

pervasive belief. His desire to make the school a place of Christian education meant more to Arnold than the words imply. He did not just mean that there should be more sermons, more reading of the Scriptures and more opportunities to discuss religious topics. It had to be borne in mind that the boys would grow into Christian men. "His education, in short, it was once observed amidst the vehement outcry by which he used to be assailed, was not . . . based upon religion, but was itself religious."⁵⁵ He stressed the high priority he placed on religion in the boys' lives on one occasion when he said:

What we must look for here is, 1st, religious and moral principles; 2ndly, gentlemanly conduct; 3rdly, intellectual ability.⁵⁶

With this constant stress on the religious life went an emphasis on personal growth which was best brought about by self-government.

You know that mine (Rugby School) is a commonwealth, or rather one of Aristotle's or Plato's perfect Kingdoms, where the king is superior by nature to all his subjects. My great desire is to teach my boys to govern themselves--a much better thing than to govern them well myself. Only in their case they never can be quite able to govern themselves, and will need some of my government.⁵⁷

Arnold was not suggesting that he would, or could, govern the school by himself. He required the Sixth Form and he also required first-class assistant masters.

In his dealings with his staff Arnold showed himself to be abreast of the times and helped to create a major factor in the growth of organised games. One of his first moves was to give his staff both status and financial stability. The latter was obtained by persuading the trustees to raise the fees and then to devote much of the increased income to raising the salaries of the assistant masters. This, in turn,

enabled him to ask that they resign from any other posts that they held.⁵⁸ He then established a system of weekly councils when all the school matters were discussed; he gradually placed the boarding-houses under the care of the assistant masters and arranged an elaborate system of private tuition which gave the staff the chance to have much greater personal contact with the boys than hitherto. His requirements for assistant masters were high,⁵⁹ but he wanted

...to get here (at Rugby) a society of intelligent, gentlemanly, and active men, who may permanently keep up the character of the school, and make it 'vile damnum,' if I were to break my neck tomorrow...⁶⁰

He succeeded in building a staff that was loyal, hard-working and enthusiastic, and of an extremely high calibre. Many of these men became headmasters of other schools and took with them both Arnold's methods and the game of football as played at Rugby.⁶¹

The changes brought about in the relationship of the staff to the boys had a considerable effect upon the games in the school. In the first place the greater intimacy between staff and pupil which the private tuition and the boarding houses engendered was part of the civilising process. Up to Arnold's time, and for some time after in some schools, a state of natural enmity had existed between boys and masters. He thought, by placing them in closer contact, he would be able "...to encourage a pastoral and friendly relation between them..."⁶² There is little doubt that this did happen and that the boys became much more friendly towards the masters than had been the case before. Tom Brown's School-days provides an excellent example of boys and masters enjoying an amicable relationship during Tom's conversation with the young master during and after the final

cricket match. Such familiarity would have been unthinkable a decade or so before in most schools in England.⁶³

The fact that Arnold was able to raise the salaries of the masters also had repercussions that were felt throughout school life and again, without having a direct bearing on the games situation, must have contributed to an atmosphere in the school which was peculiarly suitable to the growth of games. The greater income that the masters enjoyed not only gave them an increased self-respect, but also enabled them to give more time to their teaching, as they were now forbidden to accept other positions in order to supplement their incomes. The result was that the masters were in the school more, and in more frequent contact with the boys, thus helping to establish the paternalistic pattern for which Arnold was striving.

Undoubtedly the change which had the most direct and the greatest influence on games in the school was the institution of the boarding house system. Before Arnold's time the custom had been for the boys to live in "Dames houses" which meant that they were boarded out in a number of houses in the town.⁶⁴ The disadvantages of having the boys live with people who were not directly responsible for their behaviour are obvious. Further, when the masters accepted boarding houses they were then entitled to a share in the profits accruing from the boarding fees. Once the boys became part of the official system and members of a House, there grew up, quite naturally, a feeling of group-loyalty and a spirit of competition between the Houses. This loyalty was soon manifested on the playing fields. William Delafield Arnold, the son of Dr. Arnold, wrote a description of a football match,

in which forty Sixth Formers competed against the rest of the school.

In describing the school players, Arnold says:

There they stand, those two hundred, --the scarlet and gold of the School House; the green and gold of Cotton's; the purple and silver star of Mayor's; the flushing red and crescent of Arnold's; the orange and silver of Price's; the crossed black of Anstey's, all stand in terrible array against the devoted band.⁶⁵

It is not certain when this match took place, or indeed, if it were an actual match, but the description is undoubtedly accurate and shows that there were house colours of some sort at this time. William Arnold left Rugby in 1846, so that his description must belong to the time his father was headmaster or shortly thereafter. The trend towards House teams with the caps and colours that became such a feature of the later Public Schools can be clearly seen in its infancy here.

Another of the features of the later Public Schools, and, indeed of the Victorian age, was the intense competition that became apparent in many aspects of life. Industrialism and the growth of new fields of endeavour gave men the opportunity to make fortunes. They could start with less of a handicap than hitherto as the areas were so completely novel that no one had any experience of them. The competitive element is seen in a number of ways and one of the most obvious was the ever-increasing stress that was laid on examinations. Gradually the universities either introduced examinations or made those that already existed sufficiently difficult to enable an honest assessment of the candidates to be made. Arnold realised the importance of examinations in all branches of life, including the universities, as he shows in one of his sermons:

What was accounted great learning some years ago is no longer reckoned such; what was in the days of our fathers only an ordinary and excusable ignorance is esteemed as something disgraceful now. In these things, as in all others, never was competition so active--never were such great exertions needed to gain success. Those who are in the world know this already; and if there are any of you who do not know it, it is fit that you should be made aware of it. Every profession, every institution in the country, will be strung up to a higher tone; examinations will be more and more searching; the qualifications for every public honourable office, will be raised more and more. All this will be certainly; and no human power can stop it; and I think also, that it ought to be.⁶⁶

It seems certain that a belief as strong as this would have found its way to the playing fields, as well as into the examination room.

Examinations had been a part of Rugby school life before Arnold's time, but he gave much more stress to them than had his predecessors. He contributed liberally to the founding of scholarships and prizes and examined every boy in the school at regular intervals.⁶⁷ It is not difficult to see how this spirit of competition could very easily be carried over into the playing fields, especially after the introduction of houses. Certainly in the country as a whole competitiveness grew throughout the century and was reflected in a similar growth in the organised games; the accounts of games at Rugby school during Arnold's tenure show that there was a strong competitive element involved.⁶⁸

Another aspect of games which is characteristic of the age is the seriousness and earnestness that became so much a part of them towards the end of the nineteenth century.⁶⁹ Life to the Victorians was a serious business; they were earnest people to whom life "was no pilgrimage of pleasure, but a scene of toil, of effort, of appointed work--...".⁷⁰ Arnold was an exemplar of this attitude, to the extent that it was said of him that he had invented the word "earnest."⁷¹

There is no doubt that Arnold tried to instill into the boys his earnest spirit, and equally there is no doubt that he succeeded in many cases.⁷²

Arnold's serious outlook on life was seen in his recreational pursuits, which he regarded in much the same way that later Victorians did, as preparation for work to come: this trait is apparent in a letter he wrote to the Rev. John Tucker in August of 1828, just before taking up his duties at Rugby:

The Rugby prospect I contemplate with a very strong interest: the work I am not afraid of, if I can get my proper exercise; but I want absolute play, like a boy, and neither riding nor walking will make up for my leaping-pole and gallows, and bathing, when the youths used to go with me, and I felt completely for the time a boy as they were. It is this entire relaxation, I think . . . that gives me so keen an appetite for my work at other times,⁷³

In fact it is clear, from reading Arnold's letters, that he considered relaxation as positively sinful, unless it were being used as a means of recuperation and preparation for the serious work ahead.⁷⁴

When this attitude is seen so strongly in Arnold as well as in so many of his contemporaries⁷⁵ and when it appears in the games situation in a marked fashion, it would seem likely that the games at Rugby must have been influenced by this trait. Contemporary accounts of the games certainly bear out the fact that they were a serious business as far as the boys were concerned.⁷⁶ As Tom Brown's friend East says: "... it's no joke playing-up in a match,"⁷⁷

Arnold's moral earnestness and his belief in work were closely related, as was the case with a majority of the Victorian middle-classes. Arnold was a compulsive worker, a perfect example of the Protestant work ethic in action, of whom it was said: his children "were brought up on the precept, ' "Work." Not, work at this or that--

but work. ' ' These precepts were not only evident in Arnold as a young man, but were passed on by him to his pupils even when he was at Laleham, as one of his pupils attests:

(Laleham) ... was a place where a new comer at once felt that a great and earnest work was going forward. Dr. Arnold's great power as a private tutor resided in this, that he gave such an intense earnestness to life. Every pupil was made to feel that there was a work for him to do--that his happiness as well as his duty lay in doing that work well. ⁷⁹

Arnold "worked" at his play. He disapproved of anything that could be termed revelling⁸⁰ and his attitude affected some of his pupils at least and must have been reflected in the attitude that was adopted by them in their games. ⁸¹

Arnold's strong Protestant beliefs were tempered by his great regard for the Greeks and especially Aristotle, by whom he was very much influenced. ⁸² His views towards physical activity are, therefore, somewhat ambivalent. On the one hand, and this was the predominant belief, he saw exercise as necessary in order to prepare the higher faculties for future work; on the other hand he did have a eudaemonistic concept of man. According to Stanley he believed in

the Greek union of the (gymnastic excellencē) with the (musical excellencē) (which) he thought invaluable in education, and he held that the freedom of the sports of public schools was particularly favourable to it; ⁸³

The net result of this amalgamation of beliefs was that Arnold was a strong proponent of physical activity, with a stress on its vigorous nature and its ability to provide complete absorption.

His love of vigorous activity and his need for absolute engrossment in that activity are well brought out in many letters he wrote throughout his life. When he was contemplating the move to Rugby

from Laleham one of his major concerns was that he

... could no more bathe daily in the clear Thames, nor wear old coats and Russia duck trousers, nor hang on a gallows, nor climb a pole,⁸⁴

It was, therefore, with great pleasure that he was able to write to his friend Hawkins, after he had been at Rugby for three months or so, and tell him that, "I get more regular Exercise, I think, than at Laleham."⁸⁵ His exercise consisted of daily walks, when his wife accompanied him on her pony,⁸⁶ bathing,⁸⁷ throwing spears,⁸⁸ and gymnastics. In 1831 he mentions in a letter to the Archbishop of Dublin:

I have got a gallows at last, and am quite happy; it is like getting a new twenty horse-power in my capacities for work.⁸⁹

Again the emphasis on the benefits of exercise in preparing him for work is clearly stated. Four years later, in a letter to an old pupil, he comments:

Remember, however, that exercise must not be wearisome, and especially not wearisome to the mind, if it is to be really beneficial. I never have regarded a regular walk along a road, talking the while on subjects of interest, as exercise in the true sense of the term. A skirmish over the country is a very different thing, and so is all that partakes of the character of play or sport.⁹⁰

It seems highly probable that a man with this view of physical activity and of play would have passed on some of his enthusiasm to his pupils and would have viewed with approbation their own games.

The boys at Rugby were encouraged to exercise regularly, although Arnold does not seem to have participated with them as he did at Laleham. His gymnastic exercises, spear-throwing and leaping were carried on in his garden, to which the boys would not normally

be admitted. He put gymnastic equipment on the Island for the boys' use, which caused Clough to write to his friend Simpkinson, circa May of 1836, that the fags were wanting to obtain access to the Island because of the swings, vaulting poles and "all kind of monkey-trick instruments" that had been installed there.⁹¹ Even after his students had left school, Arnold continued to take an interest in their physical activities. In a number of letters to Stanley he speaks of him getting exercise, and in one he expresses the wish that Stanley could visit Rugby where he "...would have regular exercise," ⁹²

Arnold was happy in the company of healthy young men and felt that it was necessary for schoolmasters to be lively and vigorous if they were to be fully effective. Some three years after moving to Rugby, in giving advice to a friend, he says:

I enjoyed, and do enjoy, the society of youths of seventeen or eighteen, for they are all alive in limbs and spirits at least, if not in mind, while in older persons the body and spirits often become lazy and languid without the mind gaining any vigour to compensate for it. ... I should say, have your pupils a good deal with you, and be as familiar with them as you possibly can. I did this continually more and more before I left Laleham, going to bathe with them, leaping and all other gymnastic exercises within my capacity, and sometimes sailing or rowing with them. They I believe always liked it, and I enjoyed it myself like a boy, and found myself constantly the better for it.⁹³

He placed so much stress on his own physical fitness as a mark of his ability to perform his function as a headmaster that he would say, "When I find that I cannot run up the library stairs, I shall know that it is time for me to go."⁹⁴

A staff of young men was an essential part of Arnold's plans for the school, and it is said that he encouraged his assistant masters to participate in the activities that he enjoyed, because he felt that they

needed regular exercise in order to keep fit and alert. The younger masters he tried to interest in pole-vaulting as well as leaping and gymnastics.⁹⁵ Following Arnold's creation of boarding-houses and tutoring responsibilities for the staff, it is likely that they provided one avenue through which the headmaster's love of exercise may have influenced the pupils and their games.

During Arnold's tenure the only games with any form of organisation were football, cricket and fives. Of these, fives does not seem to have played a major role in the boys' lives whereas football and cricket dominated their leisure time, each in its season.⁹⁶ The change-over from cricket to football and the excitement of the boys at the prospect of returning to the premier game are well described by William Arnold.⁹⁷ The teams, in football, were quite fluid, as they were in all schools of the period. On at least one occasion, the date is unknown, (but it was most likely at the time of the Reform Bill when Lord Grey's government replaced the Tories in office) the boys, very excited by the fact that Parliament was being dissolved, and further stimulated by Arnold's liberal opinions, arranged a football match: "Liberals versus Conservatives." The resulting brawl had to be stopped by the masters.⁹⁸ Although this was exceptional, the game was very rough and even brutal. Hacking, or deliberately kicking the other players' shins, was an accepted part of the game and in after years men bemoaned the fact that the present generation no longer played the tough game they had played in their youth.⁹⁹ As late as 1846, when the rules were committed to writing, hacking was permitted, although there were restrictions. It was

forbidden, for instance, to hold and hack, while "no one wearing projecting nails or iron plates on the soles or heels of his shoes or boots shall be allowed to play."¹⁰⁰ Tom Brown's School-days gives a very good account of the game as it was played in Arnold's time and the popularity that he ascribes to it is attested by other writers.¹⁰¹

The Rugby Magazine, for July 1837, speaks, en passant of cricket and football, among other activities, such as walking, fishing, snowballing, fives and leaping across the river. Cricket and football metaphors are used in a way that shows that it is expected that the readers will be fully conversant with them.¹⁰² In fact Rugby, throughout Arnold's tenure, was much like any other Public School of the period, and games and athletic heroes played a major part in the boys' lives. A few were different and deplored "the predominance of feeling over reason--a respect paid to physical rather than intellectual excellence--..." and the "...zeal with which rivals contested the palm of excellence at foot-ball or cricket, which was not surpassed by the emulation of the combatants at the Pythian or Olympic games."¹⁰³ The editors of the Rugby Magazine, December, 1836, in discussing the Rugby Register note that "we recognise as we go on looking through the Register the best cricketer, the best foot-ball player..." rather than the best scholar.¹⁰⁴ It was said of this period, as it could well be said of almost any other, that if a boy were not a good games-player then his name was soon forgotten.¹⁰⁵

The game of football that was played at Rugby, known as "Big Side" presumably because the ground on which it was played had that name, was such a prominent part of school life that it was well-known

outside the school. It is significant that when Queen Adelaide paid her royal visit to the school she wanted to see the boys play football.¹⁰⁶ Obviously the game had more than local fame when it could arouse the interest of a lady who was no longer young and lived a life far-removed from the Public Schools.

Football, until shortly after Arnold's tenure, was ruled by custom; there were no written rules until 1845.¹⁰⁷ The senior boys would hold a levee on the Island whenever there was a dispute on the rules and the decision was passed on by word of mouth.¹⁰⁸ The civilising effect of Arnold's work can be seen in the fact that levees were held at all and that they were conducted with some decorum. It is possible that the Debating Society which was started in the thirties helped the boys to see the benefits of some law and order in their meetings.¹⁰⁹ The fact that the numbers of boys taking part in the games were reduced circa 1839 or 1840, that running with the ball was legalized by a levee in 1841-2, and that "caps" were introduced a few years after that, help to demonstrate that the game was being influenced by the increased attention being paid to the rights of the individual, to skill rather than brawn, and to official recognition of the game.¹¹⁰

The editors of The Rugby Miscellany demonstrated the status held by cricket and football four years after Arnold's death when they said: "Our Miscellany is an abiding proof that Rugby has a mind for something besides cricket, in which she has attained at least average excellence, and football where she is facile princeps."¹¹¹ Cricket, however, had flourished at Rugby since before the turn of the century,

and scores have been kept since 1831, three years after Arnold came to the school. The M. C. C. match of 1840 was followed by a game at the school the following year. This later match forms the basis of the description of Tom Brown's last game of cricket at Rugby. It is interesting to note that Hughes says that Arnold, although he did not wait to watch the game, did finalise all the preparations before leaving for the Lake District to start his holidays.

While there is no evidence to show that Arnold enjoyed football, although he played the game while a schoolboy, he did play and delight in cricket. In 1835 he writes to his friend Coleridge:

And I had divers happy little matches at Cricket with my own Boys in the School Field, --on the very Cricket Ground of "the Eleven," that is of the best Players in the School, on which when the School is assembled no profane Person may encroach.¹¹²

In the same year he writes to Hawkins, "My elder Boys are getting on with their Cricket as well as with their work, --and their Tutor is as kind to them about the one as about the other:--... ." ¹¹³ In 1833 he mentions, in a letter to Hull, "Indeed the work is full heavy just now, but the fry are learning cricket, and we play nice matches sometimes, to my great refreshment... ." ¹¹⁴ It is even said that he employed a professional to coach his sons. ¹¹⁵

It is possible that Arnold, knowing the weight that was placed on physical prowess by the mass of the boys at school, wanted his sons to stand comparison with their fellows. That he must have known how great the attention was that was paid to games is obvious. It is shown by his many references to the dangers of boys gaining a reputation because of their physical prowess, but it is best demonstrated by the

way he used the boys' love of cricket in order to stop a custom which he considered bad.

For many years it had been the practice to make the Island attractive for Speech Day by digging it up and planting flowers. This, in itself was not so bad, but the trouble was that the fags, who were forced to prepare the Island by using small pieces of stick, or occasionally a broken dinner fork, were responsible for collecting the flowers for the final decoration. Thus it was that many a local visitor on Speech Day saw his prize blooms, which had mysteriously disappeared a few days before, gracing the Island. In 1836 Arnold put a stop to the custom by the simple expedient of moving the date of Speech Day to the end of the Summer Half, when the boys were so engrossed with cricket that they would not spare the time to "dress" the Island, as the custom was called.¹¹⁶

Beyond an appreciation of the place games held in the boys' life there is no evidence to show that Arnold actively encouraged games. In Tom Brown's Schooldays it is said that he saw to the arrangements prior to the game against the M. C. C., and that he watched a football game for half-an-hour.¹¹⁷ One Old Rugbeian, in recalling his school-days, comments:

I have heard it said of late years that Arnold discouraged athletic games, and that a school of young prigs grew up under his influence, but I entirely disagree with this. Rugby football had a great name in my day, and Arnold encouraged us to play it. I remember his coming out in his garden which was raised three or four feet above the level of the School field, and divided from it by a low wall, and standing there watching us.¹¹⁸

This would seem to be faint praise for the man who is renowned as the progenitor of the athletic cult!

Arnold did take enough interest in the school games to be able to report on them to those of his correspondents who might be interested. In writing to an Old Boy in 1840 he says:

All things are going on here much as usual. The football matches are in great vigour. The sixth match is over, being settled in one day by the defeat of the Sixth. The School-house match is pending, and the School-house have (sic) kicked one goal. ¹¹⁹

His knowledge of the state of the games suggests that he either spent a long time watching from over the garden wall, or that he was interested enough to make enquiries. Even if he asked simply in order to include the information in the letter, it shows that he was aware of the matters that the boys and the Old Boys found of interest.

The boys had interests other than football and cricket, but many of these did not meet with Arnold's approval and were stopped. The episode in which six boys were expelled for poaching fish was one of many. Arnold, in common with many middle-class men, had no sympathy with the Barbarian pursuits of shooting and hunting, as he makes clear in a letter to Coleridge, dated January 2, 1841, within eighteen months of his death:

... for my sympathy with Sporting is of the smallest, as it always seems to me to take up the Room of some nobler or purer Energy, -- If our Minds were comprehensive enough & life were long enough to follow after with Pleasure every Pursuit not sinful, I can fancy that it would be better to like shooting than not to like it; but as things are, all our Life must be a Selection, and Pursuits must be Neglected because we have not Time of Mind to spare for them; so that I cannot but think that shooting & fishing in our State of Society must always be indulged at the Expense of something better. ¹²⁰

This attitude resulted in Arnold forbidding the boys at Rugby to participate in the Barbarian country pursuits, which undoubtedly forced them into the organised, Philistine games, especially football and

cricket.¹²¹

There are a number of reasons for Arnold to have preferred football and cricket to shooting and fishing and one of the strongest was that the latter did not prepare one for the work to come as did anything "that partakes of the character of play or sport."¹²² The Puritan strain in Arnold was too strong for him simply to enjoy his pastimes, he had to feel that there was a positive benefit involved: "The evil that is in the world makes it a sin to resign ourselves to any enjoyment, except as a permitted refreshment to strengthen us for duty to come," is a theme he repeats very often.¹²³

The most pervasive aspect of Arnold's work at Rugby was the civilising effect it had on the life of the school. This aspect was reinforced by the general ethos of the times. Some of the changes Arnold made, such as the introduction of boarding houses, and the legalising of the praepostor's power, had a greater, and more obvious, effect on the path that the games took than others. Nevertheless, the culminative effect of Arnold's influence was to make the school increasingly Philistine and decreasingly Barbarian in its outlook. It was a change that mirrored what was taking place in society as a whole, so that Arnold was not battling against the tide of public opinion, especially that sector of the public in which he was most interested: the liberal-minded, middle-classes, whose sons he wanted at Rugby.¹²⁴

Arnold, then, had a considerable influence on the growth of the games of football and cricket, and in the manner in which they developed, but his influence was totally indirect. That is to say, he did not interfere in the boys' games; he did not make rules regarding the games; he

did not actively promote the games. Or, if he did do any of those things there is no evidence extant. The influence he did exert was much more subtle, and by its nature does not allow an analysis of Arnold's feelings towards the two major sports as part of school life. It is possible to see that he approved of them. If he had not, he would certainly have changed them. The fact that football and cricket were flourishing before his time and continued to do so, leaves no way of knowing whether he would have promoted them if they had not already formed an integral part of school life.

The climate of Rugby School during Arnold's tenure was obviously conducive to the growth and popularisation of football and cricket. There is no doubt whatsoever that Arnold was the genius loci and it was his personality as much as his reforms that created the ethos of the school. The boys who grew up in that atmosphere of work, religious fervour, increasing supervision and growing Philistinism, went out into the world imbued, to a greater or lesser extent, with Arnold's ideals and opinions. The influence of this exceptional man was also felt by the assistant masters who worked with him. Many of the masters and many of the boys later became Head Masters or assistant masters in other schools in the country. Often they took with them something of the Rugby spirit, as well as some of the practical aspects of the school's administration, and many of them carried Rugby Big Side football with them to their new schools.

Not only Marlborough but other new schools for the middle classes accepted Arnoldianism and with it the cult of athleticism and the game of Rugby football. During the fifties and sixties Clifton, Haileybury, Wellington and King Edward VI School, Birmingham, all had headmasters who had been pupils or masters under Arnold and they all adopted the Rugby game, as did many other schools. ¹²⁵

An examination of the work and beliefs of the Arnoldians could well throw light on Arnold's position viz à viz the growth of organised games and the athletic cult in the Public Schools of the later nineteenth century.

NOTES

¹Letter to the Rev. John Tucker, dated Laleham, March 2, (1828). Reprinted in A. P. Stanley, The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D. (London: B. Fellowes, 1844), p. 85, letter no: XXIV. Arnold found it necessary to assure the trustees that he did not intend to make violent changes (as well as his friends and the assistant masters at Rugby!) See Norman Wymer, Dr. Arnold of Rugby (Robert Hales Ltd., 1953), p. 89.

The major sources used in preparing this chapter are: Stanley, op. cit., Wymer, op. cit., T. W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London: The Cresset Press, 1960); T. W. Bamford ed. Thomas Arnold on Education (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970). The two books by Bamford are distinguished as "Bamford, 1960" and "Bamford 1970" respectively. The works by Stanley, Wymer and Bamford 1960 are biographies, but Bamford 1970 is a collection of excerpts from many of Arnold's writings and this is, undoubtedly, the most readily available source of Arnold's thoughts on education. Bamford has extracted almost all that Arnold wrote that is at all connected with education for inclusion in this volume. Some of the extracts are quite short and often there are parts omitted with no indication that this is the case. Apart from that, this book is an extremely useful work of reference. The excerpts are taken from a wide selection of Arnold's work, including his letters as well as his published works. Bamford has used the 1901 edition of Stanley, op. cit., whereas the present writer has used the 1844 edition, which means that many of the letters and references cited in this text which also appear in Bamford's text have different page numbers and often the letters are numbered differently. Comparisons are most easily made by utilising the dates of letters.

The above-named texts have been supplemented by a number of other books, which are cited as necessary, and also a great number of articles, most of which were written either at the time of Arnold's death in 1842, or shortly thereafter, or at the time of the publication of Stanley's biography, in 1844. Finally MSS from a number of sources have been used. Primarily these sources are: The Temple Reading Room, Rugby School (MS designated "Rugby MS"), the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford (MS designated "Bodleian MS" followed by the appropriate numbering used by the library), The British Museum Manuscript Room (MSS designated "British Museum MS," followed by the number used by the Museum).

²Letter to the Rev. George Cornish, dated Laleham, November, 30, 1827. Reprinted by Stanley, op. cit., p. 83. Letter no: XXI.

Despite this hope, Arnold was constantly aware of evil in the school, as is shown by his letters and sermons. See Bamford, 1970, pp. 48-53, for instance, where parts of Arnold's sermons appear in which he speaks of this problem, and also Stanley, op. cit., passim.

³Thomas Arnold, Sermons: Christian Life at School. First published 1832. There are several editions of this work, of which the 1878 edition is probably the easiest to obtain. However, Bamford, 1970, has quoted quite extensively from Arnold's six books of Sermons, and has used the 1878 collected edition. The present quote is from a sermon contained in Volume 2 of the 1878 edition and is reprinted by Bamford, 1970, on pp. 48-51. Arnold uses Bowdler's words as his text.

⁴Letter to the Rev. George Cornish, loc. cit.

⁵Letter to the Rev. John Tucker, loc. cit.

⁶Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 86. Letter to the Rev. F. C. Blackstone, dated Laleham, March 14, 1828. Letter no: XXV.

⁷Ibid. Letter to the Rev. John Tucker, loc. cit. See also ibid., p. 185.

⁸The expression "Godliness and Good Learning" is used as a theme in Newsome's book of the same name. His thesis is that godliness and good learning was an ideal which schoolmasters like Arnold strove for in the first half of the nineteenth century, and which was typical of the middle-classes of the period. See David Newsome, Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal. (London: John Murray, 1961), passim.

⁹See Stanley, op. cit., p. 128, for an indication of the attacks to which Arnold was subjected for this aspect of his work.

¹⁰Worsley says: "And the reorganized Arnold Public Schools set the pattern for the next hundred years. The Rugby of Arnold . . . shows us a Barbarian school in the process of transformation (to a Philistine school)." T. C. Worsley, Barbarians and Philistines (London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1940) p. 46.

¹¹The term "games" is used to mean football and cricket, as these were the most important games in the schools throughout the nineteenth century. Other activities of the boys are covered by such terms as "pastimes" and "Barbarian pursuits."

¹²See P. C. McIntosh, Physical Education in England Since 1800 (London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd., 1968), chapters I-III passim, for an excellent discussion of the growth of the athletic cult.

¹³Rugby Magazine, October, 1835. Vol. I, No: 2, p. 96. The same quotation is used by J. R. de S. Honey, "The Victorian Public School, 1828-1902: The School as a Community." Unpublished D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1969. This thesis is due to be published in 1972, under a different title.

¹⁴Arnold reiterates this sentiment many times in his writings, but the essence is contained in this quote by Stanley, op. cit., p. 121. "When I have confidence in the Sixth, there is no post in England which I would exchange for this; but if they do not support me, I must go." See also Arnold's letter to T. Hughes in this chapter.

¹⁵Thomas Arnold, "On the Discipline of Public Schools," Quarterly Journal of Education, 1835. Reprinted in A. P. Stanley ed. The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D. D. (London: B. Fellowes, 1845), pp. 361-380. The quotation appears on p. 371.

¹⁶See Stanley, op. cit., p. 124, and ibid., pp. 82-3, letter to Rev. E. Hawkins, dated Laleham, October 21, 1827. Letter No: XX. See also letter to Thomas Hughes quoted in this chapter.

¹⁷Quoted by Stanley, ibid., Vol. I, pp. 119-20.

¹⁸See Wymer, op. cit., p. 109; and Stanley, op. cit., p. 100.

¹⁹There were several years when the Sixth Form was comprised of boys who were not of a suitable calibre. In a letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge, dated Rugby, May 28, 1837, Arnold said, "Here I am baffled continually by the utter Mediocrity of Character, -- ... and what to do when you get a Number of such Characters near the Head of a School together, passes all my wit to discover." Bodleian MS Eng lett d. 130.

See also Bodleian MS Eng lett C. 189, letter from A. H. Clough to his sister Annie (undated), as well as Thomas Hughes, Memoir of a Brother (London: Macmillan & Co., 1873), p. 32. Hughes is writing of the year 1839, only three years before Arnold's death. See also letter of Clough to Gell, Bodleian MS Eng lett c. 189, passim, particularly one dated October 24, 1835.

²⁰See McIntosh, op. cit., pp. 32-3.

²¹Letter from Arnold to Thomas Hughes, reprinted in The Meteor, June 25, 1892, in an article written by Hughes.

²²See Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 141. Newsome, op. cit., also discusses this Arnoldian trait, pp. 50-55. One would not see a lack of ability to understand children from reading Wymer, op. cit., or Stanley, op. cit. One's impression from reading Arnold's own works is that he had some blind spots, but on the whole understood boy-nature only too well.

²³Stanley, op. cit., pp. 176-7, who quotes letter from Arnold to Sir T. Pasley, but does not give the date.

²⁴Quoted by McIntosh, op. cit., p. 32.

²⁵It is said that when the keeper failed to identify the seventh, a boy named Oswell, a sigh of relief went up from the assembled school.

Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 71-3, recounts the story in considerable detail. One of his major points is that the boys were using nets. Hughes, Memoirs, op. cit., p. 26, however, says that the boys were only using rods. Hughes quotes a letter from his brother, addressed to his home, and dated April, 1837.

²⁶Quoted by Stanley, op. cit., p. 114.

For Arnold's views on a Christian education see Bamford, 1970, op. cit., pp. 68-77, where extracts from Arnold's Sermons, 1878 edition are given: Vol. 5, pp. 88-96; Vol. 2, pp. 170-2; Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 359-61; letter to a pupil, dated Grasmere, July 15, 1833, letter no: LXVII; ibid., pp. 419-422; letter to a person distressed by sceptical doubts, dated Rugby, June 21, 1835, letter no: CV; and ibid., pp. 251-2, letter to a parent holding unitarian opinions, dated Rugby, June 15, 1829, letter no: VI.

²⁷See Bamford, 1970, op. cit., p. 26.

²⁸Application to the Trustees. Quoted by Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 162 as a footnote. See also Wymer, op. cit., pp. 114-5.

²⁹Quoted by Stanley, op. cit., p. 124.

³⁰See Stanley's comments, op. cit., pp. 123-8, and the letters from Arnold that he reprints, pp. 126-7.

Arnold defended his system of using praeposters and of removing unsuitable boys at length in "On the Discipline of Public Schools," which first appeared in the Quarterly Journal of Education, in 1835, Vol. IX, No: XVIII, pp. 281-92. It is reprinted in full in Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 363-79.

³¹Undated letter quoted by Stanley, op. cit., p. 128.

See also ibid., p. 124, where Stanley quotes Arnold as saying: "Till a man learns that the first, second, and third duty of a school-master is to get rid of unpromising subjects, a great public school will never be what it might be, and what it ought to be."

³²Ibid., Vol. I, p. 126. Stanley reproduces, as a footnote, five letters to heads of colleges or private tutors regarding various pupils who have been superannuated. The letter quoted in the text is no: 3.

³³See Arnold "Discipline" op. cit., passim for a complete discussion of his views on the subject.

See also Stanley, op. cit., pp. 114-5 for Stanley's comments, and ibid., pp. 245-6, letter to the Rev. F. C. Blackstone, from Arnold, dated Rugby, September 28, 1828.

Note also the well known remark of Arnold that when the boys protested that they were telling the truth: "If you say so, that is quite enough, of course I believe your word." Stanley comments that "there grew up, in consequence, a general feeling that it was a shame to tell Arnold a lie--he always believes one." Stanley, ibid., Vol. I, pp. 112-3.

³⁴See "Discipline," op. cit., passim.

³⁵See Stanley, op. cit., pp. 245-6, letter to the Rev. F. C. Blackstone, dated Rugby, September 28, 1828.

See also "Discipline," op. cit.

³⁶Bamford, 1960, stresses Arnold's reputation as a flogger, but gives no other evidence apart from the March incident.

³⁷See The Origin of Rugby Football by a Sub-Committee of the Old Rugbeian Society, (Rugby: A. J. Lawrence), 1897, Appendices A and B.

See also W. H. D. Rouse, A History of Rugby School (London: Duckworth & Co., 1898), pp. 262-6, passim.

³⁸This account is taken from Bamford, 1960, op. cit., who gives considerably more detail than is presented here. For Arnold's views on flogging see "Discipline" op. cit. An abbreviated version of this article is to be found in Bamford, 1970, op. cit., pp. 121-136.

³⁹Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 112-3.

⁴⁰Quoted ibid., pp. 134-5.

Arnold states his views on the use of the classics very fully

and thoroughly in his article in the Quarterly Journal of Education, "Use of the Classics," op. cit., which is reprinted in Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 339-60.

See also Bodleian MS Eng lett d. 130, letter to Coleridge, dated Laleham, December 2, 1825, and also ibid., to the same, dated November 1, 1830, where Arnold mentions he has had a man to teach anatomy.

⁴¹Arnold, "Classics" op. cit., as reprinted on p. 349 of Miscellaneous Works, op. cit.

⁴²Ibid., p. 354.

⁴³Stanley, op. cit., Appendix B., pp. 356-361, gives some of the topics that Arnold used as subjects for essays and verse compositions. The ones given are those Arnold set in the last half-year of his life. Most are in Latin, but of those in English there are some which give an indication of his overall method, such as: A Conversation between Thomas Aquinas, James Watt and Sir Walter Scott; The Principal Events and Men of England, France, Germany and Holland, A.D. 1600; The Good and the Evil which Resulted from the Seven Years' War. Although not mentioned here by Stanley, there was one occasion when Arnold set the Sixth Form the subject of the life of Old Parr, a Shropshire farm labourer who lived to be 152, and saw ten reigns, from Edward IV to Charles I. The boys were to write of the many things he must have seen during his lifetime, such as the carts filled with arrows and sheaves heading for Flodden Field, the introduction of the chained bibles, the changes in agriculture and so on. See Wymer, op. cit., p. 129.

See also Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 141, 149-50.

See also Anon., "Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold," The Edinburgh Review, January 1845--April 1845, Vol. LXXXI, No: CLXIII, p. 229, where the author states that Arnold "extended considerably the range of studies."

⁴⁴Letter to J. T. Coleridge, dated Rugby, November 4, 1829. Reproduced by Stanley, op. cit., pp. 258-60.

⁴⁵Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 201.

See the Quarterly Journal of Education, Vol. VII, No: XIV, "Rugby School--Use of the Classics," op. cit.

See also Bamford, 1970, op. cit., pp. 114-7, and Stanley, Vol. II, op. cit., pp. 48-9, letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge, dated Rugby September 23, 1836, letter no: CXXXVIII; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 262-6, to the same, dated Fox How, June 26, 1841, letter no: CCLXX; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 213-5, letter to the Rev. Herbert Hill, Rugby, May 8, 1840, letter no: CCXXXVI; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 36-7, letter to Dr. Greenhill, dated Rugby, May 9, 1836, letter no: CXXXI; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 126-7, letter to the Rev. Dr. Hawkins, dated Fox How, August 5,

1838. (Stanley reproduces two letters here but gives only one date) letter no: CLXXXIII.

See also the Preface to Vol. III of Arnold's edition of Thucydides, in which he speaks of the study of History. The Preface, first published in 1835, is reproduced in Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 383-99. See p. 399 in particular, and also Bamford, 1970, op. cit., p. 117.

⁴⁶Wymer, op. cit., p. 126.

⁴⁷Stanley, op. cit., pp. 136-7.

See also Edinburgh Review, Vol. LXXXI, No: CLXIII, p. 229, op. cit.

The instruction in modern language was altered a number of times, but finally both French and German were taught, and at one period a Frenchman taught the French.

⁴⁸Thomas Arnold, "On the Divisions and Mutual Relations of Knowledge," lecture to the Members of the Mechanics' Institute of Rugby, as reprinted in Arnold's Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., p. 423.

Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 117-8, reports that an Adam Walker, and later his son, D. F. Walker, had visited the school triennially, in order to give a series of science lectures. For some, unknown, reason D. F. Walker did not receive the usual cooperation when he arrived in 1834. He complained to the local press and his letter was published. When he returned in 1837, Arnold made it virtually impossible for any boys to attend the lectures and instead they played football. It is almost certain that the dispute between Arnold and Walker had a personal bias, and was not a reflection of Arnold's views towards science.

See also Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, letter to the Rev. Herbert Hill, Rugby, May 8, 1840, letter no: CCXXXVI, pp. 213-5, where Arnold, now in his twelfth year at Rugby, says, "...I do really think that with boys and young men, it is not right to leave them in ignorance of the beginnings of physical science."

See also ibid., pp. 36-7, letter to Dr. Greenhill, dated Rugby, May 9, 1836, letter no: CXXXI.

⁴⁹Letter to Dr. Greenhill, loc. cit.

⁵⁰Quoted by Stanley, ibid., Vol. I, p. 100.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 100-101.

⁵²Ibid., p. 140.

⁵³Arnold, "Classics," op. cit., Reprinted in Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 341-360. The quote appears on p. 356.

⁵⁴Stanley, op. cit., pp. 139-140.

⁵⁵Stanley, op. cit., p. 107.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 102.

The extract is contained in an address that Arnold made to the Sixth Form. It was his custom to give them periodic "pep-talks" and this formed part of one such speech.

⁵⁷Letter dated March 16, 1829. Reprinted by Bamford, 1970, op. cit., p. 101. Bamford cites Stanley, op. cit., but is using the 1901 Teachers' Edition, and the letter does not appear to have formed part of the 1844, third edition used by this writer.

It is interesting that Thomas Hughes, Tom Brown's School-Days (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1967), p. 300, says: "'What a sight it is, 'broke in the master, 'the Doctor as a ruler! Perhaps ours is the only little corner of the British Empire which is thoroughly, wisely and strongly ruled just now.' " Stanley, op. cit., p. 99, says, "...he governed the school precisely on the same principles as he would have governed a great empire;"

See also ibid., pp. 106-7.

See Bamford, 1970, op. cit., pp. 78-93, for excerpts dealing with the problems of boyhood and the need for government by staff. The extracts are taken from Sermons, Vol. IV; pp. 8-10 and 17-30; Sermons, Vol. V, pp. 59-63, 66-82 and 149-52, as well as Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 85, letter to the Rev. John Tucker, dated Laleham, March 2, 1828, letter no: XXIV and ibid., Vol. II, pp. 45-6, letter to Sir J. Franklin, dated Fox How, July 20, 1836, letter no: CXXXVI, and ibid., Vol. I, pp. 383-4, letter to the Rev. Dr. Longley, dated Rugby, June 25, 1834, letter no: LXXXIII.

⁵⁸It was customary, at this time, for assistant masters to supplement their incomes by holding a curacy or some other parochial post. Arnold not only made this unnecessary, but obtained from the Bishop the acknowledgement of their posts as titles for order. See Stanley, ibid., p. 103.

⁵⁹Stanley prints two letters in which Arnold states his requirements for assistant masters. Basically he asks for a man who is a Christian and a gentleman, and one who understands boys; one whose scholarship is high and who believes that education is important. The master should also be continually improving his knowledge and scholarship, and at the same time be actively interested in the local community. Small wonder that Arnold paid highly for his help, or that his staff was one of the best ever collected together in a nineteenth century Public

School. Ibid., pp. 104-5.

⁶⁰ Letter of inquiry for a Master, undated. Reprinted ibid., p. 104. See also Letter to a Master on His appointment, also undated and reprinted ibid., pp. 104-5.

See Bamford, 1970, op. cit., pp. 94-105, for extracts that illustrate Arnold's views on the art of teaching and the role and duties of a headmaster and his staff. The extracts are taken from: Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 152-3, letter to the Under Secretary of State, dated Rugby, March 19, 1839, letter no: CXCI. Bamford also prints excerpts from three letters: no: CXXXI, dated 22 June, 1836, p. 411; no: V, dated 16 March, 1829, p. 221, and no: CCXXIII, dated June 27, 1836, p. 412, from the 1901 edition, which do not appear to have formed part of the 1844 edition used here. Other excerpts are: Stanley, Vol. II, op. cit., pp. 198-9; letter to Sir Culling E. Smith, dated Rugby, February 14, 1840, letter no: CCXXII; ibid., p. 154, letter to the Under Secretary of State, dated July 1, 1839, letter no: CXVI; ibid., pp. 248-50, letter to the Rev. J. Hearn, dated Fox How, January 25, 1841, letter no: CCLXII; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 24-6, letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge, dated Rugby, March 2, 1836, letter no: CXXII; ibid., Vol. I, pp. 430-32, letter to Mr. E. Wise, dated Rugby, March 20, 1839, letter no: CXCI; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 222-3, letter to the Rev. H. Balston, dated Rugby, August 17, 1840; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 175-7, to the same, dated Rugby, November 21, 1839, letter no: CCIX; ibid., Vol. I, pp. 383-4, letter to the Rev. Dr. Longley, dated Rugby, June 25, 1834, letter no: LXXXIII; ibid., Vol. II, pp. 248-50, letter to the Rev. J. Hearn, dated Fox How, January 25, 1841, letter no: CCLXII; ibid., Vol. I, undated letter quoted by Stanley on p. 124, Vol. I, undated letter quoted by Stanley on p. 124, and an undated letter quoted on pp. 128-9; ibid., Vol. I, pp. 398-40, letter to the Rev. Longley, dated Fox How, January 28, 1835, letter no: XCIV.

See also Miscellaneous Works, op. cit., pp. 226-30, "Education of the Middle Classes," originally printed in the Sheffield Courant, April, 1832.

⁶¹ See McIntosh, op. cit., p. 39.

⁶² Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 103.

⁶³ Hughes, School-days, op. cit., Chapter VIII, passim.

⁶⁴ See Rouse, op. cit., p. 195.

In fact when the new school was built--during Wooll's tenure--School House was made to accommodate sixty or seventy boys and one other house, owned by Mr. Birch, one of the masters was included.

⁶⁵ E. M. Goulburn, ed. The Book of Rugby School: Its History and Its Daily Life, 1856, p. 160.

The description is written by William Delafield Arnold, and although the book was published in 1856, Arnold makes it clear that he is speaking of the game as it was some years before.

⁶⁶T. Arnold. Sermon II (1828-31) pp. 166-7. As quoted by Honey, op. cit., p. 19.

⁶⁷This is well attested. See Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 130, for example.

⁶⁸See, for instance, Hughes, Schooldays, passim and H. E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870 (New York: Yale University Press, 1957), passim.

⁶⁹This is a characteristic that is noted by many writers. For one example see McIntosh, op. cit., Chapter V, passim.

⁷⁰W. R. Greg, Westminster Review 1844, Vol. 42, p. 380. See also Houghton, op. cit., p. 221.

⁷¹See Newsome, op. cit., p. 34.

⁷²Ibid., p. 50. This extreme earnestness is noted by many writers.

⁷³Stanley, op. cit., p. 93, letter to the Rev. John Tucker, dated Laleham, August, 1828. Letter no: XXXI.

See also letter to the Rev. Dr. Edward Hawkins, dated Fledborough, July 15, 1826, where Arnold says: "...and it is wonderful what a great Relief I find it, to have no regular writing or reading from Morning to Night, and to be a great Deal out in the Air, and that at any Hour of the Day I please." Rugby MS.

Even his favorite pastimes were not always sufficient. "I verily think," he says to the Archbishop of Dublin in 1831, "not...even spearing itself, will enable me to be cheerful..." Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 308. Letter dated Rugby, November 8, 1831. Letter no: XXXIX.

⁷⁴See, for example, Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 174.

⁷⁵See Houghton, op. cit., Chapter X, passim.

⁷⁶See for example, Hughes, School-days, passim and W. D. Arnold pp. 147-94, Goulburn, op. cit., passim.

⁷⁷Hughes, School-days, op. cit., p. 97.

⁷⁸See Greg, op. cit., p. 380.
See also, Houghton, op. cit., p. 221.

⁷⁹Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 41. The author of the letter here quoted is Bonamy Price who later became one of Arnold's assistant masters at Rugby.

⁸⁰See ibid., Vol. I, p. 174, for a typical comment by Arnold.

⁸¹See R. E. Prothero and G. G. Bradley, The Life and Correspondence of A. P. Stanley (London: John Murray, 1893), p. 104, for comments re: Stanley's feeling that it was his duty to take regular exercise.

⁸²See Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 17 and 74, Vol. II, p. 266.
See also Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 5, 46, 123 and 211, and E. L. Williamson, Jr., The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1964), pp. 30-2, 91, and 171-2.

In a letter from Arnold to Stanley he says: "I believe that all my opinions, religious and political, may be traced to the Scriptures and Aristotle together;" Rugby MS.

⁸³Stanley, op. cit., p. 130. The words in square brackets are a translation of the Greek which appears in the original. However, it must be pointed out that the translation does not do justice to the original, which is, presumably, why Arnold chose to use Greek. Gymnastics and Gymnastic Excellence, in the Greek, have a much wider meaning and significance than can be given in English, and the same is true of "music." In effect, Arnold is asking for mens sana in corpore sano.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 83. Letter to the Rev. George Cornish, dated Laleham, November 30, 1827. Letter no: XXI.

⁸⁵Letter to Hawkins, dated Rugby, November 16, 1828. Rugby MS.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 245. Letter to the Rev. F. C. Blackstone, dated Rugby, September 28, 1828. Letter no: II.

See also Arnold's letter to his sister Fran. dated Rugby May 11, 1841, in which he mentions walking with his wife while she rode her

pony, and also bathing; and see his letter to the same, dated Rugby, October 2, 1840, in which he speaks of bathing in the river. Rugby, MSS.

⁸⁸Stanley, op. cit., p. 305. Letter to W. W. Hull, dated Rugby, October 26, 1831. Letter no: XXXVII.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 290. Letter to the Archbishop of Dublin, dated Rugby, March 7, 1831. Letter no: XXVI.

It is not certain what Arnold's gallows was like, but it was probably taken from Gymnastik fur die Jugend and was little more than a form of high bar.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 430. Letter to an old pupil, dated Rugby, October 30, 1835.

⁹¹Letter from A. H. Clough to Simpkinson, undated, but given a tentative date ca. May, 1836. Bodleian MS Eng lett c. 189. There are various other works in which this equipment is mentioned, and a pair of parallel bars evidently lay on the Island for many years after Arnold's death until they rotted away.

⁹²Letter to A. P. Stanley, dated September 20, 1837. Rugby MS.

⁹³Stanley, op. cit., pp. 36-7. Stanley quotes the letter, but gives only the date, 1831, and does not name the friend to whom it was written.

See also ibid. Vol. I, p. 253, letter to the Rev. George Cornish, dated Rugby, September 2, 1829. Letter no: VII.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 170.

⁹⁵Wymer, op. cit., p. 106.

⁹⁶See G. H. Bettinson, Rugby School, (Birmingham: Harold Saunders Ltd., 1929), p. 135, who quotes a letter from Bradby, dated August 29, 1839.

⁹⁷W. D. Arnold "Football," in Goulburn, op. cit., passim.

⁹⁸For a full account of the incident see The New Rugbeian, No: VI, Vol. II, for April, 1860. By this date, eighteen years after Arnold's death, there were still many people in, or connected with the school who would have been able to verify this story, so it seems likely to be basically accurate.

⁹⁹See for example Littel's Living Age, No: 706, December 5, 1857. Vol. 19, pp. 578-591.

¹⁰⁰See Origin of Rugby Football, op. cit., Appendix A.

¹⁰¹There are many accounts of school life under Arnold, and many personal letters extant which corroborate Hughes' general picture of the bullying, games-playing, etc. J. N. Simpkinson, who was at school with Stanley, and therefore, while Hughes was there, states in a letter to the authors of Stanley's Life, op. cit., p. 68, "Rugby was a rough place in those times, as is seen sufficiently in 'Tom Brown's School Days,'" G. G. Bradley, who entered Rugby in 1837, says "The innumerable readers of 'Tom Brown' will find in it a faithful picture of the rougher side of school life as it presented itself in the earlier days of our great Head Master." G. G. Bradley, Recollections of Arthur Penhryn Stanley (London: John Murray, 1883), p. 23. Even Stanley declared "...when he read that book, that the picture given of Dr. Arnold in the book was truer to the original than the picture which he had drawn in the life that he wrote and published," Dr. Temple, writing in The Meteor, April 3, 1894, p. 30.

In an article called, "Arnold and Rugby," published in Macmillan's Magazine, 30:279, Stanley says of Tom Brown's School-days, "that admirable book gives you the best idea of what Arnold was to Rugby;"

Recent commentators who have examined the writings of the period agree that the book does present an accurate picture. "...all critics of Tom Brown agree that the robuster sections are excellent pictures of school life;" Worsley, op. cit., p. 46.

Bamford, speaking of 1839-40, says: "This period also provides some of the setting for Tom Brown's Schooldays, and those contemporaries of Thomas Hughes who have left records vouch for its accuracy. Although fictional it is fiction based on fact, and indeed many of the portraits were claimed to be of actual people. Unfortunately, in many cases several claims were made for each character, and that fact indicates that the background and spirit of the book was common to many of the houses." Bamford, 1960, op. cit., p. 148.

Arbuthnot, who played in the game watched by Queen Adelaide and who was very fond of games, although not one of the best in the school, says, in his Memoirs, that "it was a remarkable book and gave a very good account of life at Rugby in our day." Sir Alexander J. Arbuthnot, (ed. Lady Constance Arbuthnot) Memories of Rugby and India (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1910), p. 48. Arbuthnot was at Rugby from 1832 to 1840.

There is no doubt that Hughes' account of the school and especially the sporting life of the school, can be accepted with few reservations. It has truly been said that "...more people would take their ideas of the principles and genuine life of Rugby School from Tom Hughes' writings than from any other book they could possibly read." Dr. Temple, Headmaster of Rugby School, 1857-69. The Meteor, April 3, 1894, p. 30.

¹⁰²The Rugby Magazine, Vol. II, No: VII, July 1837, pp. 388-394. The editors and contributors were boys like Stanley, Vaughan, Lake, Fox, and Clough, who were ardent disciples of Arnold and were particularly upset at the constant, vitriolic attacks that were being made upon him from many quarters, but especially the local newspapers. They thought that a good magazine which would reach the homes of many prominent people across the land, would do something to show that Arnold could produce pupils who were capable of better than average work. In fact the standard of the magazine, which lasted about two years, the life-span it was decided upon before the venture started, was exceptionally high. It is difficult to believe that the articles could have been produced by Sixth Form boys and young men in their first year of university.

The magazine also speaks of boys being "floored and flogged," and mentions "chairing" and "cobbing." It is possible that these practices no longer existed, but it is difficult to tell from the context and it appears likely that at this time, (1837) boys were still being subjected to these initiation rites.

¹⁰³The Rugby Magazine, Vol. II, No: I, October, 1835, pp. 101 and 167.

Football and cricket are mentioned quite often in the various volumes of the Rugby Magazine. See for example, the October edition, pp. 199-205, passim.

¹⁰⁴Anon, "The Rugby Register," The Rugby Magazine, Vol. II, No: VI, December 1836, p. 107.

¹⁰⁵Bradley, op. cit., p. 30. Bradley is citing a man who was at school with Stanley.

¹⁰⁶The game is well attested. It forms a chapter in Tom Brown's School-days, and is mentioned in Bamford, 1960, op. cit., pp. 145 and 187; Wymer, op. cit., pp. 181-2; Arbuthnot, op. cit., p. 32. Arbuthnot had the honour of "kicking off" in the game.

¹⁰⁷The earliest rules quoted in The Origin of Rugby Football, op. cit., are for 1846, but Frances J. Woodward, The Doctor's Disciples (London: Oxford University Press 1954), p. 183, says of William Delafield Arnold that "Perhaps his chief title to a place in the Rugbeian Valhalla rests on his work with two others in the first codification of the rules of Rugby Football, in 1845."

¹⁰⁸The Sixth Form levees are mentioned in a number of works. See, for example, letter from Thomas Hughes, reproduced in The Origin of Rugby Football, op. cit., p. 13.

¹⁰⁹ See Wymer, op. cit., p. 174.

¹¹⁰ See Bradley, op. cit., pp. 187-197.

¹¹¹ The Rugby Miscellany, No: VII, February 1846, p. 224. The Miscellany was similar to the Rugby Magazine: "Three years afterwards, not long after we had sustained the greatest loss that ever school did sustain, several of us thought of taking advantage of the opportunity when for a moment the attention of the country was fixed more especially upon Rugby, and by the revival of a magazine, doing something at once to exemplify the teaching of our late Head Master, and assist, so far we might, the incipient labours of his successor." Ibid., p. 22.

¹¹² Letter to Justice Coleridge, dated Rugby, October 12, 1835. Bodleian MS Eng lett d. 130.

This letter is reproduced by Stanley, op. cit., pp. 430-2, Vol. I, Letter no: CXIV.

¹¹³ Letter to the Rev. Dr. Hawkins, dated Rugby, May 27, 1835. Rugby MS.

This letter is reproduced in Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 418-9, but Stanley omits this portion of the letter.

¹¹⁴ Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 361. Letter to W. W. Hull, dated Rugby, June 24, 1833. Letter no: LXVIII.

¹¹⁵ See McIntosh, op. cit., p. 30, where he mentions the professional coach for Arnold's children.

Wymer, op. cit., p. 142, also makes the statement but cites as his authority the letter to Coleridge noted above, and neither the MS nor Stanley's reproduction of it (Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 430-2) contain this. The quotation could be read to mean that the tutor was coaching them. However, he could have meant that the tutor allowed them time off from their studies in order to play.

¹¹⁶ See G. H. Bettinson, Rugby School (Birmingham: Harold Saunders Ltd., 1929), p. 133.

¹¹⁷ Hughes Schooldays, op. cit., pp. 293 and 118.

¹¹⁸ Arbuthnot, op. cit., pp. 31-2.

¹¹⁹ See Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 231. Letter to W. Seton Karr, dated Rugby, October 5, 1840. Letter no: CCXLVI.

For Arnold's views on including school news to friends, see ibid., letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge dated Rugby, March 2, 1836. Letter no: CXXII.

¹²⁰ Letter to Coleridge, dated Fox How, January 2, 1841. Bodleian MS Eng lett d. 130.

This letter is reproduced in Stanley, op. cit., p. 243.

¹²¹ See McIntosh, op. cit., Chapter 2, passim and pp. 32-3 in particular.

¹²² Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 430. Letter to an old pupil dated Rugby, October 30, 1835.

¹²³ Thomas Arnold, Sermons: On the Christian Course and Character (London: B. Fellowes, 1841), pp. 61-2.

See "Arnold's Travelling Journal" as given in Stanley, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 378, where Arnold, sitting above Lake Como in August, 1829, says: "But to see it (the beauty around him) as we are now doing, in our moments of recreation, to strengthen us for work to come, ..." and also ibid., Vol. I, p. 174, when Stanley says: "...the distinction he would point out to them between mere amusement and such as encroached on the next day's duties, when as he said 'it immediately becomes what St. Paul calls revelling.' "

See also ibid., Vol. II, p. 374, an extract dated May 19, 1872. "May God ... give me grace ... that I may make this relaxation really useful, and hallow it as his gift, through Christ Jesus."

See also Prothero and Bradley, op. cit., p. 104, where Vaughan is quoted as saying that Stanley had a "...solemn sense of the duty of air and exercise... ."

¹²⁴ See T. W. Bamford, "Public Schools and Social Class, 1801-1850" British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 12, 1961, pp. 224-235, for a full discussion of the composition of the main schools of the period.

¹²⁵ McIntosh, op. cit., p. 39.

So have I filled my Paper. - But it is idle to write upon things of this kind, - as no letter will hold all that is to be said, much less answer the objections on the other Side. - Write to me when you can, & tell me about yourself fully. - And believe me ever to be, Roughly, March 4th 1835. -

My dear Stanley, Very sincerely & affectionately yours,
T. Arnold.

You must have thought that I was never going to answer your kind letter at all; - but I have never forgotten it, & only delayed it latterly because I have had so many letters, which I was obliged to write, demanding my Attention. - I was sorry to miss you at Abberley last month, where we were received with its usual Hospitality & Kindness; - and where we were delighted to meet Lady Perry. Since that time I have heard of you through Greenhill, - whom I beg to thank for his letter, - and I am very glad to find that we have a chance of seeing you at Easter. - If so I hope you will take up your abode with us, and come to us as early as possible, - for I think of remaining down at Westmoreland for 12 Hours after the great dinner, - and shall then hope to see my Friends rather before the Speeches than after them, - unless they can come in the week following, when all I hope will be again going on regularly.

I am delighted that you like Oxford, - nor am I the least afraid of your liking it too much. - It does not follow because one admires & loves the surpassing Beauty of the Place & its Associations, or because one forms in it the most valuable & most delightful Friendships, that therefore one is to uphold its Follies, and try to perpetuate its Faults. - My love for any Place or Person or Institution is exactly the Measure of my Desire to reform them; - a doctrine which seems to me

LETTER FROM DR. ARNOLD
TO A. P. STANLEY. BROTHERTON
LIBRARY LEEDS UNIVERSITY.

PART III
THE ARNOLDIANS

CHAPTER VI

THE MAJOR ARNOLDIANS

He is the best teacher of others who is best taught himself; that which we know and love we cannot but communicate; that which we know and do not love we soon, I think, cease to know.

Thomas Arnold.

The increased adherence to Philistine values and the reduction of the Barbarian elements that Arnold achieved at Rugby influenced both staff and boys. Strengthening this influence were the societal pressures and changing climate of the world outside the school. Arnold's personality was a major factor in the new spirit that pervaded the school. His was a forceful character and his influence on those with whom he came into close contact was strong. Some people who worked closely with him not only adopted his ideas, but even copied his mannerisms.¹

It would be impossible to live for a number of years in any institution and not be affected by the general air of the place, whatever it might be. It would also be very difficult to live in proximity to a man as dynamic as Arnold without having one's ideas modified to some extent. All schools are peculiarly susceptible to the influence of the headmaster and a boarding school is the most vulnerable of all. In a school where the headmaster considers himself to be in loco parentis the influence is likely to be stronger than in a school where the boys are given a considerable amount of license. These conditions were all met at Rugby during Arnold's tenure and, further, his method of holding frequent meetings with both his staff and his Sixth Form aided in spreading his ideas. His Sixth Form not only had formal meetings with him, but were also invited to his house on an informal basis, and were taught by him. Boys were likely to remain in the highest form for three years and in that time their contact with Arnold was close and continuous. The staff also were in frequent touch with the headmaster, not only in their staff meetings, but on less formal

occasions when the business of the school required it, and also at social gatherings. In all, staff and pupils, particularly those who entered the Sixth Form, had ample opportunity to meet with, talk to and learn from Arnold. The results of his ideas and his work were all around them and they could not fail to judge his methods for themselves.

During Arnold's life and even more after his death, men who were connected with him and with Rugby were in demand by other schools where, it was thought, they would be able to emulate their master.² A number of these are acknowledged to have been "Arnold-ians" or men who deliberately attempted to follow the dicta of Arnold. With some there is little evidence that their ideas were moulded in the Arnold pattern. Even those who used Arnold's methods were undoubtedly influenced by other ideas, opinions and practices and it is impossible to say how much they owed to Arnold. Even the personal assertion of a man that he was using practices he had learned from his old headmaster could be suspect, in that he might have been merely using Arnold's reputation.

Despite the problems, it does seem possible that the men who worked with Arnold as assistant masters and the boys who were in his Sixth Form, might display some overall pattern in their lives and work which could be traced back to Arnold's influence. If this pattern could be seen to extend to their use of organised games, then it might suggest that their ideas on the subject of games had been shaped at Rugby. On an individual basis, it would seem likely that if a man showed obvious links with Arnold's Rugby in matters like curriculum,

the use of a prefectorial system, expulsion, and the creation of Houses, then it would be reasonable to assume that he might also have taken his ideas on organised games from Rugby. If a sufficient number of men can be seen to have adopted many parts of the Arnoldian system and have a common attitude towards games, then the inference would become that much stronger.

Such a survey could not prove that the commonality came from Arnold, nor, if it did, that they were presenting an accurate reflection of Arnold's beliefs. There might well have been any number of other influences which they had in common and which had affected their views. On the other hand, the absence of any common ground as far as organised games is concerned, among men who were with Arnold, would suggest that his ideas on this aspect of school life were not strong enough to have influenced them. This suggestion would be strengthened if it proved to be that in other respects they tended to follow Arnold's lead.

Of all the men who were with Arnold and then went on to take positions as headmasters or assistant masters at other schools, three stand out as being exemplars of the two groups into which the men naturally fall. Charles John Vaughan, a favorite pupil of Arnold's, became headmaster of Harrow School. G. E. L. Cotton was an assistant master under Arnold; he was at Rugby for fifteen years and was closely enough attached to the Arnold household to be engaged to Arnold's daughter Jane. He became Master of Marlborough College. Both these men are credited with virtually refounding the institutions to which they went and building them up into great schools; a position

from which neither has since fallen. The third man, G. G. Bradley, took over Marlborough College when Cotton was made Bishop of Calcutta. He had been a pupil under Arnold and was an assistant master at Rugby when he accepted the headmastership of Marlborough. All three men are acknowledged to have been Arnoldians.

Charles John Vaughan was the first of the three to become a headmaster and was also the youngest. He was only 28 years old when he went to Harrow, which, although it was one of the seven major Public Schools, was suffering a decline. Within two years Vaughan raised the number of boys in the school from 69 to over two hundred, and by the end of his tenure to approximately four hundred and fifty.³

Harrow was founded in 1572,⁴ and had had an illustrious as well as a long history by the time that Vaughan arrived in 1844. Games had always been part of school life. William Lyon, the founder, had stipulated in his Statutes, that the scholars were to "drive a top, to toss a handball, to run, or to shoot, and none other."⁵ Monitors, too were included in the original Statutes, so that Vaughan had a long tradition on which to build.

In the period shortly before Vaughan went to Harrow the school was quite typical of the period, with cricket and football the major sports but with rackets and Hare-and-Hounds also popular.⁶ The Barbarian pursuits were still very much in vogue. Some of the boys kept dogs, and the beagle-pack was the absorbing interest in the winter. The boys hunted hares and rabbits, usually with the farmers' consent. It is reported, however, that the pack was broken up in 1837,

some seven years before Vaughan became headmaster, so it would seem that the Philistine influence was already being felt in the thirties. As well as hunting with the dogs some of the boys hunted with guns, while others killed their prey with stones. Stone-throwing, known as "toozling," was a very popular pastime. The boys killed birds this way and then roasted and ate them. Not content with wild birds, the boys would buy cats and ducks in order to stone them to death. Fighting was also commonplace; the masters are reputed not to have interfered and fighting is said to have become an honourable practice. There were other, less barbarous pursuits, including visiting the fair, collecting birds' eggs and studying birds. At least one boy of the period is recorded as having become an amateur taxidermist while at Harrow.

The headmaster who preceded Vaughan was Christopher Wordsworth who tried hard to bring a spirit of godliness and good learning to the school. In many ways his ideas were very similar to those of Arnold, but he does not seem to have had the force of character that enabled Arnold to carry through his reforms. Nevertheless, it was said of him, by one of his pupils:

When Dr. Wordsworth first came to Harrow he found some very bad specimens of school boys, but he rapidly improved the tone of those in the upper forms, who became better and more truthful under his influence and management.⁷

There is no doubt that his work made that of Vaughan much easier than it might otherwise have been. He built the first School Chapel; used the pulpit to instil the Christian spirit into his pupils and is recorded as having abolished many of the abuses that made life

intolerable for the younger boys. It was a sign of the times that he "had the rules for fagging reduced to writing," ⁸ In fact Wordsworth's only real fault as a headmaster was that he failed to keep enough boys in the school. It was left to his successor to bring numbers to a school that was already becoming imbued with the Philistine spirit. It is recorded that,

... in 1845 the School began a new chapter in its history with the election to the Headmastership of Charles John Vaughan, a disciple of Arnold of Rugby. . . . His first act was to ban the wild celebration of Guy Fawkes' Night, substituting for it a dinner to the monitors. He reformed the monitorial system on the lines of Arnold, raising the number of monitors to fifteen and making their appointment a public act before the whole School. The office was no longer to be one of privilege, but of duty. ⁹

In making the position of the monitors one of duty, Vaughan was expressing both the spirit of Arnold and the spirit of the age. ¹⁰ Like Arnold, Vaughan made the monitors, or prefects, a major force within the school. He acknowledged "that in the monitors who came down to him from Dr. Wordsworth he found large, if not his chief, support in his measures for reform and for the improvement of discipline." ¹¹

There is no lack of evidence to show that Vaughan used Arnold's methods at Harrow. Sydney Daryl, who was a schoolboy at Harrow during Vaughan's tenure, says of his tutor that

he was a firm and ardent believer in that system originated by Dr. Arnold at Rugby, and transplanted by Dr. Vaughan to Harrow, which has its foundation in all that is just and right--which encourages sympathy between boy and master, and engenders trust on the one hand and confidence on the other. ¹²

Vaughan has also left records showing his debt to Arnold. In December of 1844 he wrote a letter to the Governors of Harrow School in which he stresses how much he owes to his old headmaster. Testimonials that he offered at the time from a number of Rugby masters, including

G. E. L. Cotton, all speak of his close association with Arnold and his ability to carry on in the Arnold tradition.¹³ An examination of his work at Harrow demonstrates a number of ways in which Vaughan duplicated his headmaster's ideas and practices. The clearest evidence is in his use of prefects.

The prefectorial system, the hallmark of Arnold's influence, is, by its very nature, open to abuse, particularly when the senior boys have the authority to administer corporal punishment. Even at Rugby under Arnold abuses were not unknown. There was one occasion when three of the Rugby prefects attempted to punish one boy, Nicholas Marshall, after he had refused to be caned by one of the praepostors. Arnold supported the Sixth Form boys and expelled Marshall, which was entirely in keeping with his views that the Sixth had to be supported at whatever cost. The incident resulted in a considerable amount of bad publicity for Arnold and the school.¹⁴

Vaughan had a similar situation to face. A boy and a monitor had exchanged rather heated words on the football field. The following day the monitor punished the boy by giving him 31 strokes of a cane. The incident was given extensive coverage in the Times, including an editorial condemning the monitorial system and two letters from Rugby men defending it. Eventually Vaughan found himself called upon to answer to Lord Palmerston. He did so in a public letter, in which he quoted Arnold as his main source of authority and reference. Vaughan was forced into expelling the prefect, but expressed his ultimate belief in the system by raising the number of prefects from ten to fifteen.¹⁵

Before Arnold's time, assistant masters had tended to be poorly-paid men with little status. The Rugby headmaster went to considerable pains to raise the status and the salaries of his staff and thereby gathered about him top-calibre men. Vaughan, realising the benefits of possessing a high quality staff, built Harrow's up to the point where it was one of the best in the country,¹⁶ following the example of Rugby, where Arnold's assistants were well enough known for parents to send children to the school in order to be taught by a particular man.¹⁷

One of the first things that Arnold did when he went to Rugby was to try and stop the boys from drinking.¹⁸ Vaughan saw the wisdom of this move and shortly after he arrived at Harrow, he gathered the boys together in the Speech-room, and told them that "...drink was the curse of the school, and that he meant to take any and every means to put a stop to it."¹⁹

It is said of Vaughan that he respected the genius loci of Harrow and the school traditions, that "he proceeded cautiously and gradually in his reforms."²⁰ When this comment is compared with that of Fitch, who says, "The steps he (Arnold) took in the way of reform were, even when boldest and most resolute, cautious and tentative," it is easy to see the similarity of the approaches of the two headmasters.

Apart from the monitorial system, perhaps the most obvious point of similarity between Arnold and Vaughan is their use of the pulpit to exert an influence for good upon the whole school body. For both men the School Chapel was the hub of the school, and the sermons of both made a tremendous impression on the boys who sat and listened

to them.²² Arnold was the first headmaster of a Public School to preach in the School Chapel on a regular basis,²³ although the practice became widespread after he set the precedent. Of all those who adopted this method of communicating with the boys, few ever approached the heights reached by Vaughan. "Scarcely an Assistant Master or old pupil who sat in Harrow Chapel in those days fails to record some sermon which, after half a century has passed away, remains vivid in his recollection."²⁴

Another point of similarity between the master and his pupil is the fact that they both tried to limit the number of pupils in their schools, although neither was successful in keeping the numbers within the limits each set.²⁵ It is recorded of both men that they were paternalistic. It is said of Arnold that nothing affected him more than receiving a new boy from his father,²⁶ and it would appear that this care for new boys was a part of the Philistine tradition that Vaughan took with him from Rugby. On one occasion a new boy came to Harrow from the Highlands of Scotland dressed in the kilt he had always worn. Vaughan kept the boy in his study, sent for the tailor and did not allow the boy out until he had a regulation pair of trousers. The distress that the headmaster saved the boy can be well imagined.²⁷ This concern for their pupils is shown in a number of ways, and demonstrates the change from the autocratic rule of the Barbarian schools to the paternalistic government of the later schools where the masters took a personal interest in their charges. It has been said of Vaughan that "his utterances to his boys were marvellously tender, and showed that he understood their weaknesses and temptations,"²⁸ while Stanley

quotes an Old Rugbeian as saying, "If it was one of ourselves who had just spoken, he (Arnold) could not more completely have known and understood our thoughts and ideas."²⁹

Vaughan's interest in his boys extended to their physical recreations, in a similar manner to that of Arnold. The Harrow boys had no river in which to bathe, but did have a swimming pool. Vaughan, at his own expense, lined with bricks the sides and bottom of "Duck Puddle," as the pool was named, and built changing sheds and a towel-house. He also had a cottage built for a caretaker and had water pumped into the bath from an artesian well.³⁰

Vaughan's interest in the swimming facilities was undoubtedly heightened by the fact that he, like Arnold, was an avid swimmer. In a letter to H. M. Jackson, dated March 4, 1851, Vaughan mentions that he still took his seven, one, and quarter-past four o'clock walks, each prefaced by baths.³¹

It has been said that Stanley's biography of Arnold was both popular and influential. As is true of any book it was well-received because it captured the spirit of the times. Vaughan found it easier to introduce Rugby concepts into Harrow because Stanley's work had reached the school first. Charles Savile Roundell, who was head boy when Vaughan arrived, is recorded as saying that Dr. Wordsworth's Sixth Form "at once fell in with the spirit of that book."³² This ready reception of ideas that only a decade before had been received with indignation and scorn, shows that the Philistine standards were gaining general acceptance. It also helps to demonstrate the fact that while it takes an Arnold to push through reforms when the tide of public

opinion has not yet turned, other men can accomplish similar ends, with less difficulty, after the trend has been set. Vaughan's task was easier because of Arnold, and was also different. Changes that he made in Arnold's name were now acceptable; when Arnold first made similar changes at Rugby they did not meet with general approval.

The changing climate of the times must have affected the games at Harrow as it did everything else, which would make it difficult to attribute cause and effect to Vaughan even if there were ample evidence of his work in the area of games. In fact there are few references to this aspect of his headmastership, and those that are available are widely scattered. It has been said of him:

Lest the idea should anywhere prevail that Dr. Vaughan did not concern himself with school games, because he did not appear on the cricket field, Mr. Hoare mentions that 'he was very keen over the success of his house in school games, and he was especially pleased when, in 1859, we were "cock-house" at cricket, and brought the three Ebrington cricket cups into the house.'³³

In an article written shortly after Vaughan's death it is said that:

In those days Headmasters were seldom seen on cricket grounds, or personally interested themselves in games, but he did much to promote the efficiency of all that was connected with them. He was pleased with the gift of the challenge cups by Lord Ebrington. ... The Philathletic Club was also started with his express sanction and encouragement in 1852.³⁴

The author of this article, Kenelm E. Digby, had been a boy under Vaughan in the Sixth Form from Easter 1852 to Midsummer 1855, so it may be that his testimony can be relied upon. However, it must be remembered that he was writing forty-five years after he had left school; games were much more important by 1897 than they had been in the fifties; and he was writing an obituary. It is interesting that it is the efficiency with which he remembers Vaughan being concerned.

Interest in efficiency is another attribute common to the early Victorians.

The cricket grounds during Vaughan's time were rough, overcrowded and dangerous;³⁵ there was no covered racket-court, gymnasium or fives-court and the Philathletic accommodated those whose scholarship was better than their cricket, and who could find no place in the other school games.³⁶ Nevertheless, work was carried out on the cricket field³⁷ and the Hon. Frederick ("Fred") Ponsonby, Sixth Earl of Bessborough and "Bob" Grimston, who had been at Harrow together as boys circa 1829, "...devoted themselves to Harrow cricket, which they not only raised to eminence in play, but also made into a training of character."³⁸ They taught the boys sound, unselfish cricket, with the sacrifice of "self" to "side." Their emphasis was on accepting the vicissitudes of the game with good temper, quietly and in a gentlemanly spirit.³⁹

How much the work of these two men was influenced by Vaughan it is impossible to say, but it must have had the headmaster's approval, if nothing more. As their connection with Harrow cricket lasted until 1884 it is likely that their ideas of the value of cricket changed and that it is their later viewpoint that is best known. Certainly the spirit of the game, as they taught it, was typical of the second half, and even more, of the last quarter of the century. Their work was a reflection of the times, but whether it was also a reflection of Vaughan's attitude is impossible to say. It is interesting to note, however, that one of the questions raised by Vaughan's announcement of his retirement was: "Would the games be as vigorous as they had been."⁴⁰

The standard of play was certainly high during Vaughan's tenure and the school team performed well against Eton,⁴¹ which suggests that the headmaster did not object to the time that was spent on the game, although this was doubtless much less than it was later. It is said that at that time, "... success at games counted more than success in the school work," but that "games were not made the fetish of that they now [1898] are; and people then held by the old-fashioned opinion that school was primarily a place for work."⁴² Certainly the Eton-Harrow cricket match was played for the sake of the cricket at that time and was not the fashionable pic-nic that it later became.⁴³

Football, during Vaughan's time, was compulsory, with the compulsion coming from the boys, not the masters.⁴⁴ At least one of Vaughan's assistant masters, however, is reported to have played games with the boys. The monitors, it is said, could cane boys for gross brutality, cowardly bullying, "or obstinate disobedience to the well-known rules as to cricket, or racquet-fagging, or abstinence from compulsory football," The masters, even if the majority did not play games, were "very lenient in all matters relating to the sports and pastimes of the school, and would always listen to any excuse or explanation that was in the least degree plausible." They estimated "at its right value the importance of encouraging plenty of out-door exercise for the encouragement of the 'mens sana.' "⁴⁵

Sydney Daryl, a boy at Harrow during Vaughan's time, extols the virtues of skinned shins and bruises that were a part of football, and defends the compulsory aspect of the game because it forces fellows into taking exercise who otherwise would not, and prevents them from

hanging about the town and generally getting into mischief. Furthermore it "hardens and strengthens the constitution, and promotes health and good appetite."⁴⁶ Daryl does not offer any explanation as to why the game should be compulsory in order to obtain the latter advantages.

The following description of football at this time, by the same writer, makes one understand the reluctance of the "great many people" who complained of football being compulsory, and demonstrates that Harrow still retained some Barbarian elements:

It's no very pleasant sensation when you feel yourself being trampled on by a lot of heavy hob-nailed boots, and if you try to protect your face with your own hands, you are sure to get some glorious rattles over the knuckles. Then some one, pitying your plight or wanting your assistance, seizes hold of you by the first portion of your anatomy that presents itself, or not unfrequently lugs you on to your feet by the hair of your head. But after all, what are these discomforts to the glorious game, which it is gratifying to find gradually becoming very popular?⁴⁷

The fact that football is said to have been increasing in popularity suggests that it was gradually replacing the even more brutal Barbarian pursuits. In this context it is interesting to note that Daryl also mentions cricket, running races, both on the flat and over hurdles, pole-vaulting, skating, sliding, snowballing, swimming and diving, all of which have much more in common with the Philistine ethic than the Barbarian. The latter element was not completely missing, as is shown by the description of football and the fact that fighting was still a favourite pastime. Even more indicative of the encroachment of Philistine mores is the fact that in 1853 the boys petitioned the governors for a gymnasium.⁴⁸ There can be few things more removed from the Barbarian spirit of freedom and more representative of the Philistine urge for enclosure. Vaughan showed his approbation of the boys'

request by countersigning the petition.

Vaughan's endorsement of the need for a gymnasium can be seen as an expression of his interest in the boys' physical well-being and of the paternalism that marked both him and Arnold, and was so much in keeping with the tenor of the times. At Harrow under Vaughan, as at Rugby under Arnold, games flourished and obviously were accepted by the headmaster, if not actively promoted. Games were well established at Harrow before Vaughan's time so that, as with Arnold, it is impossible to say whether he would have introduced them, as was done in newer schools, had they not already existed. There is, in fact, a hint that Vaughan may have intended to stop them. In a letter from H. Montague Butler, an Old Harrovian, to Latham, who was still at school, the question is asked: "Does football flourish as ever, and has anything been definitely settled about its continuance next quarter?"⁴⁹

In keeping with the spirit of the times and with the example set him by Arnold, Vaughan promoted the competitive element in the school by introducing prizes for English essays and English poems. The boarding-house system was in vogue at Harrow before Vaughan arrived, but the number of such houses doubled during his tenure, and at Harrow, as at all the boarding-schools, the games developed best in the heat of inter-House rivalry.

There is no doubt about Vaughan being an Arnoldian in the true sense of the name. He definitely tried to use Arnoldian methods in his handling of the school, and was eminently successful. He portrays a number of characteristics that were in accord with the period in

which he worked and which, doubtless, helped his success. His attitude to the boys' physical well-being was quite positive and he went out of his way to provide them with suitable facilities. In his time cricket was being coached with a view to its character-building attributes, but there is no evidence to link Vaughan with this idea. In all, Vaughan's attitude to games-playing is as difficult to define as is Arnold's.

Vaughan carried his concept of godliness and good learning to Harrow in 1845. Seven years later, G. E. L. Cotton, the young master of Tom Brown's School-days, was called upon to take over Marlborough College, which, at that time, was in dire trouble, both financially and in terms of school spirit.

The school was new.⁵⁰ The Rev. Charles Plater had in 1842 conceived the idea of providing a first-class education, at a low price, for the sons of clergymen. By 1843 his idea was not only perfected, but had taken active and permanent shape. When Cotton was appointed Master in 1852 the permanence of the school was in considerable doubt. The low fees had brought a rush of students so that the establishment was rapidly overcrowded. Even the addition of other buildings did not ease the situation, as they were filled almost before they were completed. By 1848 the number of pupils had risen to 500, making Marlborough the second largest school in the country.

There were, in the early days, no houses, or even separate classrooms, and the boys grouped themselves, by a process of natural selection, into gangs, which were known as "tribes." These tribes roamed the countryside following their respective chieftains to play

and to battle, to innocent pastimes and others not so innocent. Many of the boys carried a "squaler," which was a piece of lead about the size and shape of a pear with a cane handle of approximately eighteen inches. This weapon was thrown at small animals, such as squirrels, rabbits and hares, and was even used against deer. The squaler was still available for sale until the mid-sixties, well after the end of Cotton's reign:

But the glory of the squaler had long been dimmed by the organisation of games, and the prestige and daredevilry that had once surrounded its use had by then vanished. Poaching had been stamped out, and squirrel-hunting reduced to be the sport of an obscure few; and, as dangerous to the small boys who still used it, the squaler, if memory serves us right, was made contraband, and finally died out.⁵¹

The stress, it will be noticed, is on games providing a legal form of activity to take the place of the Barbarian pursuits, not on games as character-builders.

Another favourite pastime in the first few years was to catch and ride the horses that were out to pasture in the neighbouring fields. A meet of the local hounds always enticed a number of the boys to attend. Tobogganing, using boughs torn from fir trees, was yet another way in which the pupils passed their time. Legend has it that Dr. Cotton, on one occasion, joined his students in speeding down the slope in this exciting, if undignified, fashion. Egg-collecting was a favourite hobby with many of the boys and it often resulted in hair-raising escapes from irate gamekeepers.⁵² Fighting was also a popular pastime, and fights were both fierce and frequent, despite the fact that combatants were severely punished if caught. The boys were allowed to bathe in the river at certain times and, as the bathing-place

was close to the miller's orchard, the boys were able to take some nourishment after their swim.

The boys' rural background and Barbarian instincts are well illustrated by the fact that if any boy were found to be in possession of a partridge or a pheasant egg he would be "thrashed within an inch of his life."⁵³ The Philistine spirit had certainly not reached the new school before Cotton arrived! In fact the conditions of grave overcrowding, lack of tradition, the Master's inexperience, the financial stress which became ever more pressing, and the very newness of the place combined to create a serious situation.

Discipline in the school became virtually non-existent. There were prefects, but they were given little authority and had no tradition on which to call. The records are full of stories of the infamous practices of the day,⁵⁴ including such unbelievable tricks as extracting blood from one victim and injecting it into another, all while the class was in progress! Food parcels were rarely eaten by the boys for whom they were intended. The tribes would swiftly fall upon any boy with such a prize and the food would disappear before his eyes. The school hero was quite definitely the best fighter, not the best scholar, or even sportsman.

The situation led, almost inevitably, to the great rebellion of 1851. The practice of punishing the many for the faults of the few led to the innocent thinking that they might as well have some of the fun if they were to be punished in any case. Insubordination grew, and with each imposition of punishment the resentment grew too. On November 5, Guy Fawkes' Day, the boys followed several days of near open

rebellion with a rampage and firework display that completely paralysed the school authority. The headmaster, unable to punish five hundred boys, expelled five. The School thought one of these expulsions to be unfair and, after a major demonstration,

windows were smashed, desks were broken, and anarchy reigned everywhere throughout the week. Fireworks still spluttered intermittently, regardless of time and place, and were even tossed into the fires against which masters were actually standing.

Peviar, the unpopular sergeant, was knocked down and thrashed by one of the fighting champions of the School, and the wooden wings of the old racket court were set on fire, which was with some difficulty quenched.⁵⁵

The headmaster, the Rev. Wilkinson, eventually called the school together and the boys stated their grievances. A truce was arranged which lasted only for about a week before a fresh uprising broke out. This second disturbance, however, was the work of a few boys who did not have the backing of the school. Floggings and expulsions were the two main punishments that were meted out, both being quite numerous. Oddly enough, although the school benefited from the removal of the most rebellious, there were some bad side effects. The places of the missing leaders were filled by weaker boys whose influence, in some ways, it is said, was worse than that of those they displaced.

In this unruly period, "physical prowess was everything, physical courage a quality that was daily put to the test," and yet, ten years later all had changed. The change has been attributed, almost solely, to the work of the new headmaster, Dr. Edward George Lynch Cotton, whose "aim from the first was to follow out the principles and spirit of Arnold."⁵⁶ If this statement be true then it can be seen that Cotton

was responsible for turning a truly Barbarian school into a place where the Philistine virtues predominated.

There is ample evidence that Cotton, like Vaughan, was a disciple of Arnold. His biographer says of him that he "thoroughly absorbed and reproduced in his own life and work the most distinctive features of Arnold's character and principles."⁵⁷ Before moving to Marlborough, Cotton had been an assistant master at Rugby for fifteen years, the first six of them during Arnold's tenure.

The influences of this appointment on his after life were incalculable. First among these must be counted the impression produced upon him by the character and teaching of his great chief. It is not too much to say that there was none of all the direct pupils of Dr. Arnold on whom so exclusive a mark of their master's mind was produced as on Cotton.⁵⁸

Cotton was greatly influenced in Arnold's favour by the Old Rugbeians at Cambridge prior to his appointment, and then

from the moment that he first made Arnold's acquaintance, he never wavered in his loyalty. He may, after his manner, have criticised and deprecated parts of his character or career. But no other hero ever took the place of the image which had thus been enshrined in his heart; there was never either in his own mind, or in the circle of his later acquaintances, any force sufficiently powerful to disturb its pre-eminence. His long continuance within the direct sphere of its influence, first at Rugby, then at Marlborough, tended to keep it intact; and when he entered on the wider field of India, the inspiring force of Arnold's genius and goodness only found a new channel in which to work, and all that was most elevating and peculiar in those bright recollections of his early youth stamped itself on every part of the task which he there undertook. There is no proof of Arnold's practical influence so undivided, so unquestionable, so little alloyed with any baser matter, as the blameless and fruitful career . . . (of Dr. Cotton).⁵⁹

Other people have noted Cotton's debt to Arnold and it has been said that it might be questioned whether any of Arnold's friends or pupils might claim "to have carried out so earnestly, and in time so successfully, the ideas and the system of which his friend was the

founder and the apostle. "⁶⁰

Cotton's Memoirs verify the claim that he was, in fact, the young master of Tom Brown's School-days, and while it is difficult to say how accurate a picture of him is presented therein, it is interesting to see the effect he had on Thomas Hughes, and the way in which Hughes recalls him. Tom, Arthur and the young master are watching a cricket match, while the two boys are waiting for their turn to bat. The fictional Cotton remarks:

The delicate play is the true thing. I don't understand cricket, so I don't enjoy those fine draws which you tell me are the best play, though when you or Raggles hit a ball hard away for six I am as delighted as anyone.⁶¹

There follows an interlude in the conversation during which Tom, as Captain, sends in the next batsman. Having done so he then remarks to the young master that he would have the chance now of seeing a hard hit or two.

'Come, none of your irony, Brown,' answers the master. 'I'm beginning to understand the game scientifically. What a noble game it is, too!' ... 'The discipline and reliance on one another which it teaches is so valuable, I think,' went on the master, 'it ought to be such an unselfish game. It merges the individual in the eleven; he doesn't play that he may win, but that his side may.' ... 'And then the Captain of the eleven!' said the master, 'what a post is his in our School-world! almost as hard as the Doctor's; requiring skill and gentleness and firmness, and I know not what other rare qualities.'⁶²

The portrait that Hughes paints of Cotton is a very sympathetic one, but how true to life it is and how much it is simply a projection of Hughes is difficult, if not impossible, to determine.⁶³ However, there follows the cricket match an incident which is so very Cotton-like that it lends verisimilitude to the whole.

After the match is over the young master invites Tom Brown to

tea. When they arrive at the master's house they find that the servants have left and they are locked out. However, they find an unbolted window and gain "burglarious entry." The fictional Cotton "chuckled grimly ... and insisted on leaving the hall-door and two of the front windows open, to frighten the truants on their return." Master and boy then forage for food and discover a newly baked dripping cake "reposing in the cook's private cupboard, awaiting her return; and as a warning to her, they finished it to the last crumb."⁶⁴ A perusal of the books that have been written on Cotton show that this is exactly the kind of episode to have appealed to him. His puckish sense of humour is remarked upon many times.

It is said that when Cotton arrived at Marlborough

his aim from the first was to follow out the principles of Arnold, to invest the sixth form with powers and responsibilities, and to make them a chief factor in the regeneration of the School.⁶⁵

In a manner that is very reminiscent of both Arnold and Vaughan, it was drinking⁶⁶ and breaking bounds that were the first offences that he attacked.⁶⁷ Unlike Harrow and Rugby, Marlborough did not have a strong tradition of games. Cotton introduced the Rugby form of football and then offered it and cricket to the boys as an inducement to remain law-abiding.⁶⁸ Cotton himself notes, in the famous "Red Book,"⁶⁹ that games were providing an increasing attraction to the detriment of poaching and drinking.⁷⁰ Other entries in the Red Book serve to confirm that it was the questions of keeping the boys within bounds and restricting their drinking that were his major concerns. Among these entries is one where Cotton lists details of the Laws of Bounds, which makes it clear that there had been considerable confusion hitherto,

and that there had been many complaints from local landowners, complaints which the Laws were intended to meet.

The Red Book was kept in the staff room and in it Cotton, and other masters, wrote comments on, and details of school life that were required to be kept on record for quick referral. This idea of putting rules down on paper is symptomatic of the civilising influence that Arnold brought to Rugby, that Cotton took to Marlborough and that was pervading the country. Written rules and regulations are typical of the Philistine attitude to life and reflect, quite clearly, Cotton's attempts to reduce the Barbarian element in the school. This Philistine propensity to put rules on paper is one that affected games both in the Public Schools and in the country, throughout the second half of the century, as more and more games became organised.

Cotton, a man imbued with Arnold's ideas, brought to Marlborough the Rugby concept of a prefectorial body. Some resentment was aroused by the powers given to the prefects in the beginning, and in answer to this feeling Cotton gathered the school together and spoke to them of the alternative to having prefects. He pointed out that when he had been told that the boys should be allowed out only in pairs and under the supervision of a master he had replied that he had no intention of adopting such a system. "The prefects are and shall be, so long as I am head, the governors of this School. As soon as I see this impracticable I will resign," he said, echoing Arnold's sentiments exactly.⁷¹

The Red Book gives explicit details of the duties of the prefects.

Firstly it shows that every boy in the Upper VIth and every boy over the age of sixteen in the Lower VIth were to be prefects. These boys were allowed to "gate" a junior boy for up to three days; give "lines," either to be learned by heart or to be written out, and they could give a culprit the choice of taking a caning or of being reported to the Master. If the lad chose to be beaten there had to be two prefects present when the punishment was administered. The maximum number of strokes was laid down as twelve, and any boy so punished had the right of appeal to the Master. Henry Palmer adds a few details, such as the fact that the prefects met every fortnight and held a "court," or meeting, similar to the Rugby levees, at which they discussed various topics relating to their duties. On occasion Cotton would send subjects for discussion. Palmer also mentions that on at least one occasion the court discussed a boy's use of unseemly language on the cricket ground.⁷²

An interesting entry in the Red Book, dated April 18th, 1855, states that compulsory fagging at cricket was no part of the authorized system of the College but, as it existed, and as there was little likelihood of stopping it, then it should be limited and abuses prevented. There then follows a set of rules limiting cricket fagging to once per day for a period of up to approximately three hours. It is also stated that rolling the grass was to count as cricket fagging, thus preventing some poor youngster from pulling the heavy roller for hours and then having to chase balls for a further period.

Obviously there were loopholes in the system and it must have been difficult to ensure that the regulations were carried out. On

February 5th, 1856, an entry appeared in the Red Book to the effect that no boy other than a prefect might fag another boy, leaving no doubt that some of the older boys, who were not yet prefects, had been usurping the privileges of the latter.

Tradition had it that Cotton revolutionised and reformed Marlborough, and doubtless this is true. Yet it is instructive to read Cotton's own remarks as they appear in the Red Book, for he constantly refers to cases of hooliganism: setting fire to hedges and bushes, damaging meadows and fences and so on. There are threats of reprisals, such as taking away half-holidays, even if this should mean the loss of a cricket game, which obviously constituted a dire threat. There are several statements of taxes levied on the boys to cover the costs of damage within the school. One such entry says that the boys must pay 9d each to cover approximately half of the £24/3/-d bill which had been incurred.

Even the Chapel was not exempt from a certain amount of disrespect. In April, 1856, Cotton complained that many boys were missing Sunday morning chapel. The prefects were, therefore, called upon to check off the names against a list and to report any absentees. Even those who were in chapel were not always attentive. Cotton notes that, despite his short-sightedness, he could see boys standing with their hands in their pockets and not looking at their books, even during the Psalms. On September 30th of the following year, Cotton had cause to complain that the boys were pushing and shoving each other as they rushed to get out of chapel at the end of the services. Obviously the transition from a Barbarian to a Philistine school was neither easy

nor swift.

On Sunday, March 5th, 1854, Cotton preached a sermon in which he talked to the boys about cheating in examinations.⁷³ However, this was quite early in his tenure, and he may have managed to change the boys' attitude by the time that he resigned in 1858. Cotton used the pulpit on a number of occasions in order to impress upon the boys some point which was strictly secular in nature. On Sunday, March 26th, 1854, he took the opportunity to talk about amicable relations between boys, prefects and masters. He also found occasion to speak to the pupils about the dangers of older boys making close friends of those much younger than themselves.⁷⁴

One angry outburst in the Red Book comes as rather a surprise, especially in view of Cotton's reputation. It appears that Cotton had had to announce some new regulation or other which had not pleased the boys and it had been greeted with hisses, groans and other manifestations of the boys' disapprobation. It is all the more surprising to note that this entry was placed in the book in the early part of 1858, Cotton's last year as Master.

The Red Book also tells of an incident, dated October 19th, 1856, when a boy named Savage escaped from the College and his disappearance was not discovered until the following day. Prior to his flight he had, evidently, stolen some money. One gets the impression that stealing money was not unknown, but that Savage had taken rather more than was customary. A further entry, on November 12th, 1856, shows that Cotton publicly expelled the boy.

The impression that stealing was commonplace is strengthened

by a letter which was written by a boy while he was at Marlborough. It is dated September 23rd, 1855, that is to say about half-way through Cotton's tenure, and is addressed to his father:

My dear Papa,

I am doing a part of Vauban's first system on a square. Mr. Taylor is not at home today, he has gone out to preach. I have not money here enough to take me home. I should not like to stop here longer than you can help, as I have every morning to get up early and go down under-ground along dark passages with only my trousers and nightshirt on and clean 4 pairs of boots. I get caught to fag at cricket and rolling the cricket ground with great heavy rollers. I have to rub the feet of 2 boys every night which is not very pleasant and to go to the clock to see what the time is, and to change ever so many basons (siċ) of water in the morning. All these I must do with only my nightshirt on. If I delay a minute I should have a licking. I have to wake fellows early in the morning and if I sleep I get ducked and licked. I sleep next bed to the greatest bully in the school. I am the smallest in my dormitory and I have to fag for about 10 fellows altogether. I get all my books bagged (faken) out of my desk and cannot find them for some time. So I get impositions for not knowing my lessons and get kept in which makes me stupid and dull. There have been 4 fellows expelled in the school whilst we have been back. Last week one fellow was caught stealing but nearly all are thieves. There are constantly stamps and small pieces of money being stolen but we cannot find out who it is, in fact the school is full of blackguards and please do not let me stay here longer than you can help, for really I do hate the school and am not at all happy here.

Give my love to all at home. I remain yours

P. T. O.

These are my reasons why I want to get away from my slavery. I think they are quite enough for I cannot bear the fagging.⁷⁵

This is the school as seen through the eyes of one small, homesick boy and doubtless life was not that bad for most of the pupils. Certainly the other ten in this boy's dormitory had a happier time than he! Nevertheless, it is clear that the school was not completely reformed at this stage in Cotton's tenure.

A note in the Red Book dated March 14th, 1857, demonstrates that betting was still part of College life. In Midsummer of the same year another entry reveals that five dozen knives and sundry other

pieces of cutlery had been stolen from the College. This, it should be noted, in Cotton's penultimate year. As late in his tenure as May of 1858 Cotton was still inscribing complaints of vandalism, such as tearing up prayer-books, breaking rails, bullying local boys and similar escapades.

It is also obvious that simply expecting the boys to behave well was not the answer, as a note of May, 1858 shows that the forest had to be put out of bounds again. Evidently it had been out of bounds, had then been brought back within bounds, in the hope that the boys would treat it with respect, but as the hope had proved to be in vain, and the boys had continued to cause damage in it, access to the forest was again denied them.

In February of 1858 an entry states that it is unlawful to snow-ball prefects and people who are not members of the school. Throwing things is common among all boys, and the Marlborough boys were like most Public School boys of the time in that they liked throwing stones, and the Red Book records that a number of boys had been injured because of the practice.

Of particular interest are the rules which appear at intervals throughout the Red Book relating to games and physical exercise. They show an increasing concern with the boys and how they utilise their spare time, as well as the growth of the importance of games in the life of the school.⁷⁶ There are, for instance, rules laid down relating to bathing, stating the times when bathing was allowed; when a master had to accompany the boys and so on.⁷⁷ Boys could be excused lessons if there were to be scorers or umpires, and masters were

allowed to excuse boys who were playing in a match in which the master was engaged.

In Cotton's second year as Master, James Lillywhite was engaged as the first School cricket professional. Others followed him until, in 1861, C. Brampton was appointed as permanent coach, which position he held for the next twenty-one years. Cricket was quickly established on a firm basis by Cotton, with the help of his assistant masters. A number of permanent annual contests were set up which lasted far beyond Cotton's tenure, although the school's first encounter with the M. C. C. did not take place until the year after Cotton had left to take up his position as Bishop of Calcutta.

Dr. Cotton was anxious to establish a connection between Rugby and Marlborough, and cricket seemed to provide the perfect medium. In 1855, therefore, the first match against Rugby was played, at Lord's. The Marlborough team was reputed to be a good one, but was easily defeated by Rugby, and the same proved to be the case in the following two years. In fact the competition was so one-sided that the games were stopped for the next two years.

One of the few indications that Cotton may have seen games as something more than purely disciplinary tools is the reasons given for allowing boys to travel to Cheltenham for a cricket match. Bradley, et al, say that "it was considered . . . a great concession to allow the Eleven to go on a visit to Cheltenham to play the first game in 1856." However, they point out that "Cotton's aim was always to invest the boys, as far as possible, with a sense of their personal responsibility to their School, and this fresh departure was a tentative step in his

policy."⁷⁸ The authors support their interpretation by citing an entry in the Cricket Minute Book, written by Cotton, in which he outlined his reasons for allowing the match to take place and his belief that his trust would not be abused. Nevertheless, it can be said that the fact that it was a cricket match is almost incidental. Cotton was, if the report is accurate, anticipating benefits from the responsibility thrown upon the boys in travelling to another school and behaving well. Presumably the same benefits would have accrued, and Cotton would have expected the same value to obtain, from sending a group of boys to act in a drama festival, a debate, or any other activity. He was not looking for the Henry Newbolt virtues involved in facing a fast bowler in a fading light. In any case the boys went to Cheltenham where they found the senior school too strong. It was not until the fourth game that Marlborough was victorious.

During the tenures of both Cotton and his successor, Bradley, Marlborough produced some good teams and some excellent individual players, but up to 1870, when Bradley retired, both Cheltenham and Rugby had proved too strong most of the time. It was not until 1872 that the College beat both Cheltenham and Rugby in the same year. It is said that the increasing popularity of games led to a decrease in the amount of bullying, if only because of the fewer opportunities that there were to indulge in it.⁷⁹

There seems little doubt, however, despite Tom Brown, that for Cotton the games were primarily a disciplinary measure, rather than a means of inculcating desirable character traits. In the circular that he sent to the parents, Cotton does say, "The mass of the School

are (sic) not trained up to cricket and foot-ball at all, which, as healthy and manly games, are certainly deserving of general encouragement." However, he also says that he hopes to encourage such amusements as will

...most obviously conduce to the good of the boys, of introducing gradually the feeling that they should keep as much as possible together as one body in the College itself and in the play-ground (and) of checking abuses of the liberty which it is necessary to allow, if Marlborough is to confer the advantages, and be conducted on the principles of English Public Schools, under which any system of entire and compulsory restriction to the college premises is quite impossible;⁸⁰

Mr. L. Warwick James, one of the authors of a new history of Marlborough College which is in preparation, agrees that Cotton's prime, if not his sole, purpose in encouraging games was purely disciplinary. Certainly the manuscripts and records in Mr. Warwick James' possession bear out this interpretation. Cotton was mainly concerned with giving the boys a legitimate outlet for their animal energies and thus with stopping them from indulging in the barbarian pursuits of poaching and roaming the countryside.

I think that there was a slow realization of the value and importance of games in the life of the school. . . . If the real educational and physical importance of games had been realised and the organisation a conscious movement based on this knowledge, they would never have been allowed to become almost greater than the whole, when the entire perspective was lost.⁸¹

Cotton's interest in physical activities was not restricted to football and cricket. In a letter dated October 10th, 1853, Cotton says that fives and rackets are "among the very best healthy games." He points out that he has both money and people well-versed in the various games and asks for assistance in building several courts. There is also extant an undated, incomplete letter from the Committee for

Restoring the Fives Courts asking for the fives courts to be restored, and Cotton's signature is the first on the list.⁸²

However, Cotton does not always speak in favour of games. The Red Book contains an entry dated May 21st, 1858, the year in which Cotton resigned, which states, without giving any reason, that all cricket and ball-playing against the old house is forbidden. In a sermon he delivered to the boys at Marlborough, Cotton points to St. Paul's use of metaphors drawn from sports, games and athletics, and then suggests that the boys ask themselves "...whether you are half as eager to be like Christ and to be loved by Him, as to be popular and distinguished among your fellows for bodily strength and activity; whether you are as desirous for improvement in gentleness, integrity, and holiness, as for success in your ordinary games;" ⁸³ He continues by saying, "...let us remember how great is our sin and folly if we really feel a keener desire for the passing amusements which accompany the short season of boyhood, than for the never-fading joys of that eternal youth, which is promised to all who love and serve" ⁸⁴ However, he does add, as Arnold might well have done, that anything which is not sinful can be used to help one approach Christ, and this would, presumably, include games.

An interesting sidelight is thrown on Cotton's ideas as related to games by an entry in Henry Palmer's Journal for May 20th, 1854, in which he says that "Cotton told me that I was going the way of all cricketers because I failed my repetitions! I asked him what he meant; he could not give me a satisfactory explanation." ⁸⁵ It should be noted

that the Journal reveals that Palmer played cricket almost daily during the season. Evidently Cotton was finding that there were penalties to be paid for the benefit of knowing where the boys were all the time and being assured that they were not annoying the local inhabitants.

It is easy to see the link between much of Cotton's work at Marlborough and that of Arnold at Rugby, especially as far as the use of the prefectorial system is concerned. There is not the same certainty as to whether the link between Cotton's use of games and Dr. Arnold can be seen; or, indeed, if there were such a link. Certainly Cotton saw the same evils at Marlborough as Arnold had seen at Rugby. Evidently he adopted similar methods to combat those evils. In Arnold's case, football and cricket were already well-established and provided an acceptable alternative to lawlessness and unruly behaviour. Cotton had to stimulate a general liking for sports on the playing fields among the Marlborough boys.⁸⁶ It may well be that his stress on organised games is that much more obvious because of that one simple fact. That is to say that Arnold did not need to promote a feeling for football and cricket because one already existed. He merely had to direct energies from the poaching, trespassing and other illegal activities into an already-formed channel. Cotton, on the other hand, had to develop a love of organised games among the majority of the boys. Certainly there was football and cricket before his time and equally a number of boys were avid players, but one gets the impression, on looking at the records, that there were not enough boys, in the early days, sufficiently interested for these games to form an acceptable substitute for their more Barbarian pursuits. Cotton, therefore, had

to stimulate the interest which, while it was already there to some extent, was not sufficiently strong to answer his needs.

This interpretation is borne out, to some extent, by the following words taken from the 1893 edition of the History of Marlborough College:

The organisation of games which was due to his (Cotton's) initiation was in some ways a still more potent factor. (Than the powers he gave to the VIth) In this he recognized the only antidote to all the outdoor troubles which had been the cause of so much mischief. He had, of course, the Rugby model in his mind, and worked hard, though he himself was indifferent to outdoor pursuits, to introduce it at Marlborough, and sent circulars round to the parents urging their support in this movement. . . . by slow degrees the poacher developed into a football player, and the bird-nester and the tickler of trout into cricketers.⁸⁷ (*Italics mine*)

The connection between Cotton's ideas on games and those of Arnold is strengthened by these further words from the same authors. After pointing out that Cotton attracted a number of devoted young men to Marlborough as assistant masters, most of whom came from Rugby, they continue by saying that

. . . these young masters carried out their leader's endeavours to make the playing-fields the chief centre of outdoor attraction for the School . . . most of them athletes as well as teachers, and full of the traditions of what was then, at any rate, as a model for Marlborough, the best school in England.⁸⁸

The authors of both official histories of the College have stressed Cotton's emphasis on organised games and have drawn strong lines connecting Marlborough to Rugby in this aspect of school life. Perusal of the extant documents suggests that Cotton's major interest in games was its disciplinary value, rather than any character-building effects that it might exhibit, contrary to the general feeling in the Public

Schools later in the century. There is little evidence to support the view that Cotton obtained his ideas from Arnold, although it does seem reasonable to suppose that Cotton saw the benefits accruing from organised games at Rugby. The most likely analysis is that when Arnold forced the Rugby boys into greater participation in organised games by restricting their out-of-school activities, Cotton had realised that the idea would work in reverse and that conscious promotion of games could restrict out-of-school activities. If this be true then Arnold was promoting games in a purely negative sense of leaving little alternative, whereas Cotton positively promoted games in order to make the boys desire no other alternative. However, the possibility still exists that Arnold was better aware of the part games were playing, and could play, than is readily apparent, and that he and Cotton had discussed this role.

Cotton's use of games as a disciplinary measure is much more in keeping with the tenor of the times than if he had promoted them for their character-building properties. It was not until well into the second half of the nineteenth century that games were generally promoted for this kind of reason.⁸⁹ In any case, before Cotton could concern himself with any form of character-building he had to reduce the element of anarchy in the school and introduce the law and order that the times demanded and which was so sadly lacking when he took over. If the accounts of his tenure are accurate he achieved considerable success, and it was much more of a Philistine school that he handed over to his successor than had been given to him. Organised games

certainly aided him in this achievement.

G. G. Bradley,⁹⁰ the man who followed Cotton as Master of Marlborough, was elected under unique circumstances. The Governors of the College had been so impressed with the work done by Cotton that, when he was elevated to the Bishopric of Calcutta, they had asked him to name his successor. The man he chose was an old friend and colleague of his, G. G. Bradley. Dr. Bradley, or Mr. Bradley, as he was when he arrived at Marlborough, had been a pupil at Rugby during Arnold's tenure and an assistant master at Rugby with Cotton. At the time of his appointment to Marlborough he was still at Rugby as housemaster of one of the largest houses, a position which was undoubtedly more financially remunerative than the headmaster's post at Marlborough.

Despite the fact that his income would be decreased and that the future of Marlborough, notwithstanding Cotton's efforts, was not yet assured, Bradley felt he could not refuse to take on the task of completing the work so ably begun by his friend. The fact that Cotton had asked him to accept the position undoubtedly affected his decision. Bradley's health was not of the most robust, but Marlborough provided a challenge that obviously caught the new man's imagination.

It has been shown that Cotton had tried to mould Marlborough along the lines that Arnold had laid down at Rugby and his desire that Bradley, who was also deeply imbued with the Rugby system, should take over from him, shows that he thought that his ideas were correct and that he wanted a man who would continue in the same pattern. It proved to be the case that Marlborough's association with Rugby was

strengthened during Bradley's tenure by the fact that many of his old Rugby pupils came to him as assistant masters. Even the gate-sergeant, a man named Voss, came from Rugby. Voss is reputed to have been the prototype of Bill, the School-house servant of Tom Brown's School-days.

Soon after taking up his new position Bradley had a large-scale poaching raid with which to content. He arraigned the whole school in merciless fashion, and demanded that the culprits report to him within the hour, with a full account of the money they had received for the rabbits and hares they had sold. Fortunately the offenders arrived in less than half the allotted time and made full restitution. Mr. Bradley's first big test as Master of Marlborough was successfully over, but it showed that the Barbarian element was still strong within the school.

Bradley continued the development of the Sixth Form and made them into an extremely loyal, public-spirited group, with a great deal of power. The Sixth regularly held courts and meetings and the punishments that this body meted out became an integral part of the school system. Fagging became strictly organised and bullying was reduced to a minimum, which helped to create the "Marlburian" spirit that arose, as did the fact that as the older boys became responsible members of the community a wholesome respect for law and order grew. In fact, middle-class values began to predominate.

Under Bradley's care the number of boys in the school continued to rise and the popularity of the school enabled the fees to be raised again, which supplied the necessary money for a racket court and a fives court to be included among some building improvements. The

boys were also encouraged to form a Natural History Society, which proved to be one of the most popular and long-lasting of all Marlborough institutions.

In the manner of Arnold and of Vaughan, and to a large extent from the same source, Bradley built up a good staff. The high calibre of his assistants, coupled with the growing reputation of Marlborough (in 1859 the school captured both Balliol Scholarships) led to other schools trying to entice Bradley's men away. The improved spirit in the college, the growing numbers and the high teaching standards led to there being a considerable contingent of Old Marlburians at Oxford, especially during the sixties, and the reputation of the college was extremely high.

Partly, however, the success of Marlborough could be attributed to the state of the older-established schools. Eton, Rugby and Harrow were flourishing, but none of the other older schools was in great favour at this time. Of the newer ones, only Cheltenham was strong enough to pose a real challenge to Marlborough, but the fact that Cheltenham was a day-school primarily, and concentrated on military, rather than classical, education, left Marlborough in a unique position from which it benefited by an ever-growing reputation for scholastic prowess. In the 1867 Schools' Inquiry Commission Report Marlborough was cited as fourth of the major schools in the numbers of men in residence at Oxford and Cambridge, while Rugby and Marlborough were reported to have far more holders of open scholarships at the two universities than any other major school. As well as these academic honours, it is recorded that the Oxford cricket XI had five old

Marlburians in the team and another as twelfth man.

Arnold was always concerned about the effect of Public School life on the very young boys and tried to prevent them from entering the school. Vaughan had the same fears, but inaugurated a system of providing separate houses for them until they were considered old enough, or mature enough, to be transferred to a normal boarding-house. Bradley also instituted such houses, for "little lads of the less hardy sort,"⁹¹ a fact which demonstrates the paternalistic element which had been gaining favour since Arnold's day.

Bradley's connection with Rugby and Arnold was close and there is no doubt that he took to Marlborough much of the Arnold tradition and strengthened that which Cotton had already transplanted. The description of Bradley, by S. H. Butcher, one of his most famous pupils, highlights the similarity between him and Arnold, without, however, drawing any parallels.

It was in the sixth form that Marlburians first came to know the true character of the Head Master. To the small boys he was an object of fear. . . . Even in the fifth form the feeling towards the Master was one of awe and distant admiration. In the Sixth we came to know him personally. We valued the confidence he placed in us as prefects; we were loyally supported by him when questions of discipline arose; we had only to consult him in a difficulty to experience his infinite patience, his generous allowance for error, and unbounded kindness of heart. In his own house he was delightful in conversation, and the stern critic of our Latin prose was forgotten in the easy and playful host. Sometimes one rode with him in Savernake Forest or over the downs. On these occasions he would take his companion at once into his thoughts, and, putting aside School topics, talk freely on whatever subject was interesting him at the moment. Many old Marlburians can trace the beginning of a close intimacy and lifelong friendship to these days, when they were under him in the sixth form. The gentler and affectionate side of his character, once known, could never be mistaken. Some old pupils have discovered it only in later life, and been surprised that it could ever have escaped them. The truth is that the first

contact with Bradley was a little paralysing; it produced the effect of an intellectual torpedo shock. His eager vivacity, his keen and inquiring mind, bent on communicating to others what he knew himself--or rather, perhaps, on stirring in them an interest and ardour like his own--a certain impatient attitude, not indeed towards ignorance, but towards deadness, lethargy, laziness; in a word, the restless and even combative nature of the teacher obscured for the moment the other qualities which lay deeper and went to make up the real man.⁹²

The description, mutatis mutandis, might well have been written of Arnold rather than Bradley, and certainly in his management of his school Bradley adopted many of Arnold's ideas. The most striking of these was his use of the Sixth Form, but he also made it a practice to examine every boy in the school at reasonably frequent intervals, and improved the house system, which in turn served to stimulate greater participation in games, as inter-house rivalry intensified. As had happened at Rugby the competitive element was expressed on the playing field, as well as in the classroom.

By the mid-sixties, although squirrel-hunting was still a favourite pursuit, the cricket eleven was very strong, and "the increasing popularity and better organisation of games had by this time reduced the number of those who looked to the downs and fields and woods for their recreation to a small minority."⁹³ By 1865 both cricket and football were well-organised and popular, and were based on the house system. During Bradley's tenure a number of changes were made in the fives, bat-fives and racket courts. On several occasions courts were demolished but, in each case, more were built than had been destroyed. The school was, in fact, constantly acquiring attributes and characteristics that were in keeping with middle-class

ideals.

Bradley was an Arnoldian in the truest sense and ranks with Cotton and Vaughan as a headmaster and as a disciple of the Rugby Headmaster. He followed Cotton in promoting sport at Marlborough, without, however, taking the active role that Thring did at Uppingham, and his reasons for promoting it are not clear.

Vaughan, Cotton and Bradley are exemplars of Arnold's educational philosophy and all three of them promoted games. In none of the cases does it seem likely that there was any idea of developing character. Vaughan comes the nearest to showing signs of this notion by virtue of the work of Ponsonby and Grimston, but there is no evidence to link what they were doing with Vaughan, other than the obvious fact that they helped the boys with Vaughan's permission. Cotton's promotion of games was obviously a disciplinary measure, and this was probably Bradley's major concern also.

These three men, all acknowledged disciples of Arnold, were, then, advocates of organised games, although not for the reasons that became paramount in the later Public Schools. Their connection with Arnold and with Rugby is so strong, and the fact that they borrowed freely from both, is so obvious, that there is the possibility that they got their ideas on the uses, and usefulness, of games from the same sources. There is no direct evidence to make this any more than a possibility, but the influence of Arnold and Rugby was so strongly felt by these three that the possibility must be considered a valid one.

It has to be realized, however, that games were generally becoming more popular as the Barbarian pursuits fell into disrepute.

The middle-class morality, which viewed lawlessness with horror, was pervading all aspects of life at this time and public opinion was no longer willing to allow boys the freedom and wildness that had been tolerated only a decade or so before. The ethos of the times was such that, during the tenures of these men, Arnold had been made into an heroic figure who was reputed to have reformed the Public Schools. His image, however, was still basically that of the exemplar of godliness and good learning, rather than the apostle of Muscular Christianity. It was not until after the publication of Tom Brown's School-days, in 1857, that there was any general move towards seeing Arnold as the progenitor of the movement towards an increased emphasis on games.⁹⁴

In all, there is a strong possibility that it was at Rugby that Cotton, Vaughan and Bradley realised the potential that games held for inculcating Philistine ideals of law and order in the boys of large boarding schools. This observation might have been made independently of Arnold, but it seems unlikely that if they could see advantages accruing from the football and cricket of Rugby that Arnold should have remained blind to them, or that they would not have discussed them with their headmaster. There is, however, no reason to believe that any of them would have said with Ridding: "Give me a boy who is a cricketer, I can make something of him."⁹⁵

It is clear that if the trend of Arnoldians promoting games that is indicated by these three headmasters should actually appear when a number of other such men are examined, then the possibility that the

idea of promoting games came from Rugby, and ultimately from Arnold, would be greatly strengthened.

NOTES

¹See David Newsome, Godliness and Good Learning (London: John Murray, 1961), p. 96, where he notes that James Prince Lee "...even developed some of Arnold's mannerisms, gestures and expressions."

²This phenomenon is well-documented. See P. C. McIntosh, Physical Education in England Since 1800 (London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd. 1968), pp. 19 and 39 for a general statement.

For a specific instance see An Old Cheltonian, Reminiscences of Cheltenham College (London: Bemrose & Sons, 1868), pp. 160-1, where it is recorded that Henry Highton was elected to the Principalship of Cheltenham College almost solely because of the fact that he had served under Arnold. The directors had "an intense desire" to have a Rugby man for Principal.

³Leslie Stephen and Sydney Lee, Dictionary of National Biography (London: Smith, Edder and Co., 1908), Vol. XX, pp. 159-60. The figures for the years of Vaughan's tenure vary considerably from author to author. F. D. How, Six Great Schoolmasters: Hawtrey, Moberly, Kennedy, Vaughan, Temple, Bradley (London: Methuen & Co., 1905), gives them as: 1844-69; 1845-97; 1846- "the number was nearly doubled." i.e., rather less than two hundred; 1847-283, and in 1859, when Vaughan resigned, there were 466 boys. J. F. Williams, Harrow (London: Bell and Sons, 1901), p. 89, says that in 1847 the number was 315.

R. W. Moore, "Charles John Vaughan Centenary. An address by the Headmaster, 21, January, 1945." (Reprinted from the Harrovian) p. 3 gives the figures as: January, 1840-70; January 1845-138; 1846-264 and by 1859 nearly 450. Although the details on the figures differ, all writers agree that Vaughan raised them considerably. The numbers were, in fact, deliberately kept down in the last few years, partly because of the lack of accommodation and partly from the problems inherent in having too large a school.

⁴E. D. Laborde, Harrow School Yesterday and Today (London: Winchester Publications, Ltd., 1948), p. 24. footnote. In fact this is likely to have been the date it was re-founded by William Lyon, as it seems probable that a school existed long before this and at least as early as 1384, ibid., p. 22.

⁵Laborde, op. cit., p. 239. Laborde is quoting the Statutes.

⁶Rev. Henry John Torre, Recollections of School Days at Harrow, More than Fifty Years Ago (Manchester: Charles Simms & Co., 1890). The section on the boys' pastimes is all taken from Torre's work. See particularly, pp. 5; 6; 13; 14; 16; 17; 18; 23; 36 and 37.

⁷Ibid., p. 127.

See also Edward Whytehead Howson and George Townsend Warner, eds., Harrow School (London: E. Arnold, 1898), p. 103.

⁸Laborde, op. cit., p. 50.

⁹Ibid., p. 52.

Laborde, it will be noticed, gives 1845 as the year Vaughan went to Harrow. In other works the date is given as 1844.

¹⁰See W. E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957) passim, for a discussion of the Victorian sense of duty.

¹¹How, op. cit., pp. 140-1. How is quoting C. S. Roundell, who was head boy when Vaughan arrived at Harrow.

¹²Sydney Daryl, School Days at Harrow (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1867), p. 13.

See also Phyllis Grosskurth, John Addington Symonds, a Biography (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1964), p. 26, who says Vaughan was "...determined to mould the school into a counterpart of Rugby," and Horatio F. Brown, John Addington Symonds, a Biography (London: John C. Nimmo, 1895), pp. 75-6, as well as P. H. M. Bryant, Harrow (London: Blackie & Son Ltd., 1936), p. 74, who says that Vaughan set to work "...to reproduce at Harrow the methods by which his master, Arnold, had regenerated Rugby and founded the modern public school."

Percy M. Thornton, Harrow School and its Surroundings (London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1885), p. 285 says: "But in Dr. Vaughan, Arnold seemed in the eyes of many almost to live again,"

These authors are but a sample of the many who have noted Vaughan's utilisation of the Rugby system, as it is often called. His debt to Arnold is most noticeable in his use of Monitors and he acknowledged that in a public letter to Lord Palmerston.

See also, Bodleian MS. Autog. 68, No: 1570, where it says that Vaughan "...raised it (Harrow) from ill-fortune to complete

prosperity, leaving upon it both the impress of his own character and of the teaching he had imbibed under Arnold."

The Meteor, December 4th, 1897, p. 139, notes that Vaughan "...was selected to succeed Wordsworth in the Headmastership of Harrow, and rapidly raised that school from the somewhat low level to which it had fallen, endeavouring as a disciple of Arnold, to assimilate Harrow to Rugby."

The Harrovian, Vol. X, No: 8, Saturday, November 20th, 1897, p. 97. It is stated there that Dr. Vaughan's personal influence was especially felt by the elder boys in the Sixth Form, which is exactly the way in which Arnold worked.

¹³There are, in the Vaughan Library at Harrow, a number of the testimonials submitted by Vaughan when he applied for the Headmastership (some were written for his application to Rugby two years earlier, but were used by him for this second application also). Several of these testimonials point to his close association with Arnold. A letter dated July 5th, 1842, from a Rugby assistant master, Algernon Grenfell, stresses Vaughan's ability to carry on in the Arnold tradition, while one from A. P. Stanley, Arnold's biographer, of November 27th, 1844, also emphasises the debt owed by Vaughan to Arnold. Another letter from Lyttelton to the Trustees of Rugby School, dated July 11th, 1842, places great stress on Vaughan's association with Arnold.

N. B. There are letters from Charles Mayor, G. E. L. Cotton and Henry Highton, all of whom were assistant masters at Rugby at this time, which demonstrate the high regard in which Vaughan was held at Rugby. A letter from J. A. Cunningham as a testimonial for Vaughan when he applied to Harrow, says he would have had the Rugby post but for the fact that he would have been placed over three of his former masters (December 9th, 1844).

The most convincing evidence of Vaughan's debt to Arnold is Vaughan's own letter to the Governors of Harrow School, of December 4th, 1844, in which he stresses how much he owes to his old headmaster. However, there is always the possibility that Vaughan was deliberately using Arnold's reputation, which had risen rapidly since his death, but this would seem to be unlikely, and, indeed, in Vaughan's case, unnecessary.

N. B. References to MSS kept at Harrow School are cited as "Harrow MS."

¹⁴See T. W. Bamford, Thomas Arnold (London: The Cresset Press, 1960), pp. 84-6 for a full, if somewhat biased, version of the story.

¹⁵See The Times, Saturday, April 15 and Monday April 17, 1854, and various issues in the preceding weeks.

The editorial condemning the monitorial system appeared on Thursday, April 13, 1854.

Vaughan's letter to Palmerston has been reproduced in a number

of publications. See Appendix I of Percy M. Thornton, Harrow School and Its Surroundings (London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1885), for example.

¹⁶ Among the men Vaughan had as assistant masters were B. F. Westcott, later Bishop of Durham; F. W. Farrar, afterwards Master of Marlborough College, author of Eric, or Little by Little, and Dean of Canterbury; S. A. Pears, the future Headmaster of Repton School; E. H. Bradby, who became Master of Haileybury College; as well as Gustave Masson, E. E. Brown and John Smith, who had the reputation of being the best assistant master in the country.

¹⁷ See A. P. Stanley, The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D. (London: B. Fellowes, 1844), p. 103. Stanley says, "... nothing rejoiced him more than to hear of instances in which he thought that boys were sent to the school for the sake of his colleagues' instructions rather than of his own."

¹⁸ See N. Wymer, Dr. Arnold of Rugby (London: Robert Hale, Ltd., 1953), p. 119.

¹⁹ How, op. cit., p. 144.

²⁰ How, op. cit., p. 145. How is quoting Mr. Roundell, who was head boy at the time Vaughan came to Harrow.

²¹ Sir Joshua Fitch, Thomas and Mathew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 80.

See also Wymer, op. cit., p. 103.

²² Perhaps the most striking evidence of Arnold's influence on the Rugby boys is the description by Thomas Hughes in Tom Brown's School-days (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1967. First published 1857), p. 132, but it is an aspect of life at Rugby which is mentioned by virtually every commentator.

²³ See Chapter IV of this study.

²⁴ How, op. cit., p. 162.

See also The Harrovian, Vol. X, No: 8, Saturday, November 20th, 1897, where the author says, "It was however from the pulpit of the Chapel that his influence was most widely diffused." It is also stated that Vaughan regarded his office of headmaster as essentially

religious.

Grosskurth, op. cit., p. 30, remarks that Vaughan wanted the boys to be confirmed at school and prepared them himself. See also ibid., p. 32.

Howson and Warner, op. cit., p. 111, stress the fact that the excellence of Vaughan's sermons was such that they remained in the memory forty years on. They also say, "The School chapel was the centre of Dr. Vaughan's influence for good."

²⁵Vaughan tried to keep the numbers at Harrow down to 400, and Arnold attempted to restrict the numbers at Rugby to 300. See The Public Schools, op. cit., p. 292. The author notes Vaughan's desire to limit the numbers but does not make any allusion to Arnold.

Anon. The Harrow Calendar: The School Lists from January, 1845 to September, 1859, with a History of Harrow School, etc. (Harrow-on-the-Hill: Crossley & Clarke, 1860), p. xiii. The author says the numbers were restricted to 400 partly because of the lack of accommodation, but chiefly because of a deliberate recognition of the evils that might result from an unlimited expansion and constant fluctuation.

See Norman Wymer, op. cit., p. 122, for an account of Arnold's very similar views on the subject.

²⁶Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 175-6.

²⁷How, op. cit., p. 153. The story was never told by Vaughan, but came to light through the relatives of the boy some years later.

²⁸Ibid., p. 163.

²⁹Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 170.

³⁰Laborde, op. cit., p. 198.

The pool is now known as Ducker, an abbreviation of Duck Puddle. Before Vaughan's work it was a dirty puddle in which broken glass and water snakes were a constant annoyance.

Vaughan's improvements did much to turn it into a pleasant place in which to bathe, and since his time it has been improved, altered and enlarged to the point where it is a beautiful, outdoor, heated pool, guarded by a caretaker whose cottage stands on the same site as that built by Vaughan.

³¹Letter to H. M. Jackson, dated March 4, 1851. Harrow MS.

³²E. W. Howson and G. T. Warner, eds., Harrow School (London: E. Arnold, 1898), pp. 102-3.

³³Ibid., p. 113.

³⁴Kenelm E. Digby, "Recollections of Dr. Vaughan," The Harrovian, Vol. X, No: 8. (Saturday, November 20, 1897), p. 98.

³⁵Howson and Warner, op. cit., p. 217.

³⁶Ibid., p. 116.

³⁷Ibid., p. 218.

In 1845--Vaughan's first year--the Captain of the Cricket XI asked the Governors for a refund of £ 62/9/2d which had been expended on draining the cricket field. The Governors complied with the request.

There is, in the Vaughan Library at Harrow School, a letter, dated February 22, but with no year, addressed to "My Lord" which speaks of the "... expenses necessarily dependent on the Cricket," with no further explanation. It is signed by Charles Savile Roundell, the head boy on Vaughan's arrival. (The signature is difficult to decipher, but it would appear to be that of Roundell.)

³⁸Laborde, op. cit., pp. 163-5.

³⁹Howson and Warner, op. cit., p. 219.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 115.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 229.

See also Lord Desborough, Fifty Years of Sport at Oxford, Cambridge, and the Great Public Schools, Eton, Harrow and Winchester (London: Walter Southwood & Co., Ltd., 1922), pp. 132-4.

In 1844, 1845 and 1846 Eton won easily by an innings. However, from 1851 to 1859 Harrow won every year, and were not beaten from 1850 to 1862.

⁴²Howson and Warner, op. cit., p. 91.

This section of the book was written by C. S. Roundell.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Sydney Daryl, School Days at Harrow (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1867).

The following section is all taken from Daryl's work. See particularly pp. 7; 8; 48; 49; 51-2; 60 and 63.

⁴⁵Ibid. The quotations, in the order they appear in the paragraph, are taken from: p. 8; pp. 77-8; and loc. cit.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 60.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 62.

⁴⁸The original petition, signed by the Captain of the School, R. D. Wilson, is in the Vaughan Library at Harrow. Vaughan wrote at the bottom of the petition: "I shall be glad to find that it is in the power of the Governors to take this request into their favourable consideration," and then signed it as the Headmaster, and dated it, November 3, 1853.

⁴⁹Letter from H. Montague Butler to Latham, dated November 5, 1857. Harrow MS.

⁵⁰The best sources for information on Marlborough College are: A. G. Bradley, A. C. Champneys and J. W. Baines, A History of Marlborough College During Fifty Years from its Foundation to the Present Time (London: John Murray, 1893), and A. G. Bradley, A. C. Champneys and J. W. Baines, revised and continued by J. R. Taylor, H. C. Brentnall and G. C. Turner, A History of Marlborough College (London: John Murray, 1923).

⁵¹1923 History, op. cit., p. 126.

⁵²Ibid., p. 64.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴1923 History, op. cit., passim.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 161.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 167.

It is interesting to note that Arnold's influence had already reached Marlborough. In the information that was disseminated regarding the position of Master, in 1852, it is stated: "If in Holy Orders, he (the Master) has the option of being appointed Chaplain."

Information sheet, dated March 18, 1852, presently in the possession of Mr. L. Warwick James.

⁵⁷A. J. A., "Cotton, George Edward Lynch, D. D." Dictionary

of National Biography, (London: Smith, Edder and Co., 1908), Vol. IV, p. 1227.

⁵⁸Mrs. Cotton ed., Memoir of George Edward Lynch Cotton, D. D. Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan, with Selections from His Journals and Correspondence (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1872), New Edition, p. 11.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 12.

⁶⁰Rev. G. G. Bradley, "The Late Bishop of Calcutta," Macmillan's Magazine (December, 1866), p. 104.

See also ibid., p. 103, where Bradley quotes a man who knew Cotton at Trinity College Cambridge and speaks of his close relationship to Arnold.

⁶¹Thomas Hughes, Tom Brown's School-days (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1967), p. 299. First published 1857.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 299-300.

⁶³A number of authors have confirmed that the young master and Cotton are one and the same, notably Mrs. Cotton in the Memoir, op. cit., and none have suggested that the picture drawn by Hughes is not accurate.

Cotton himself, in one of his sermons, calls the book an "admirable story." See G. E. L. Cotton, Sermons and Addresses Delivered in the Chapel of Marlborough College, 1852-8 (Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1858), p. 337.

⁶⁴Hughes, op. cit., p. 304.

⁶⁵1893 History, op. cit., p. 137.

⁶⁶See Henry Palmer, Henry Palmer's Journal for 1854, which is the diary of a boy who was at Marlborough in 1854. A copy of this diary is currently in the possession of Mr. L. Warwick James of Springfield Park School, Horsham, Surrey, who is currently working on a revised edition of the school History.

Palmer mentions the Old Boys vs. School matches and says that the Vith Form, when they entertained the Old Boys to breakfast, gave them an excellent turnout, with plenty of Bass dry ale. This was in 1855, when Cotton had been Master for some three years.

An entry in another diary, R. A. L. Nunns, "The Diary of R. A. L. Nunns, for the year 1852," Supplement to The Marlburian,

August, 1931, shows that on Monday, 30 August, 1853 Cotton spoke strongly against the practice of visiting pot-houses (ale-houses).

⁶⁷1893 History, op. cit., p. 137.

⁶⁸H. C. Brentnall, "The Early Years," a chapter in Marlborough College, 1843-1943 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), pp. 8-19.

⁶⁹The Red Book which covers the period 1853-72 was kept in the school staff room and the Master and staff wrote down rules and other matters that might need to be referred to. It is currently in the possession of Mr. L. Warwick James.

⁷⁰Red Book, passim.

See also a letter from Cotton to Mr. Gill, the College Council's Secretary, dated October 10th, 1853; Cotton says that his circular to the parents (see Appendix) had met with great success and since the commencement of the current quarter only one case of trespassing and none of drinking had come up.

This letter is presently in the possession of Mr. L. Warwick James.

⁷¹1893 History, op. cit., p. 138.

See also Nunns' diary, op. cit., in which an entry appears dated Wednesday, September 22nd, 1853, noting Cotton's speech, which Nunns terms, "capital."

Further information re: the prefectorial system at Marlborough at this time can be obtained from Cotton's Sermons, op. cit., pp. 308-319, Sermon No: XXXII, where Cotton stresses the freedom and resulting responsibilities given to the boys. He describes the prefectorial system and the benefits to be derived therefrom. He also acknowledges his debt to Arnold in his ideas about prefects. (p. 315).

⁷²Palmer, op. cit., entry dated September 2nd, 1854.

⁷³Ibid., entry dated Sunday, March 5, 1854.

⁷⁴Ibid., entry dated Sunday, March 26, 1854.

⁷⁵This is a reproduction of the letter which is in the possession of Mr. L. Warwick James, which is itself a copy. It is reproduced here by kind permission of Mr. James. If this is an accurate picture, it would seem that Cotton's attempt to relieve the young boys of some of the cricket fagging had failed.

⁷⁶ An entry dated May 11th, 1857, shows that an examination for the College was timed so that it would not clash with the Cheltenham match.

On September 28th, 1857 a notice was inscribed in the book stating that there would be a half-holiday and the school time-table would be re-arranged for the sole benefit of the cricket-playing portion of the school.

⁷⁷ Nunns, op. cit., mentions very frequently that he has been bathing. On Monday, 30th August, 1853, for instance, the entry shows that he bathed three times that day. He also notes that the bathing place was emptied and refilled in September of 1854.

⁷⁸ 1923, History, op. cit., p. 255.

⁷⁹ 1893 History, op. cit., p. 148.

⁸⁰ A copy of the circular is included as Appendix D. It is interesting to note that R. A. L. Nunn's diary shows that walking was very popular with at least some of the boys, as well as the masters, at the time that Cotton arrived at Marlborough. There is little doubt that walking would lead to trespassing, which, in turn, would almost certainly mean some damage would be done and the relations between the College and the local farmers worsened.

⁸¹ L. Warwick James, personal notes being prepared for new edition of the History of Marlborough College.

⁸² These letters are currently in the possession of Mr. L. Warwick James.

See also Henry Palmer, op. cit. Palmer frequently mentions that he has played fives, so there is little doubt that it was a popular game among some of the boys.

⁸³ Cotton, Sermons, op. cit., pp. 341-2.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 343.

⁸⁵ Palmer, op. cit.

⁸⁶ Ibid., passim. Palmer amply demonstrates that by 1854 boys were playing football, cricket and fives with great enjoyment. He also mentions talks he had with Cotton about games and such matters as rolling the wicket. However, it is equally certain that games had achieved considerable popularity prior to Cotton's arrival.

⁸⁷1893 History, op. cit., pp. 139-40.

⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 146-7.

⁸⁹See P. C. McIntosh, Physical Education in England Since 1800 (London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1968), Chapters 1 to 5. McIntosh shows that games were being actively encouraged by some headmasters in the early fifties, but the movement was not general until much later, and the character-building reasons for stressing games grew as the games spread.

⁹⁰The data relating to Dr. G. G. Bradley are obtained from the 1923 History, op. cit., unless otherwise indicated.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 202.

⁹²Ibid., pp. 221-3.

For comparisons with Arnold see Wymer, op. cit., Hughes, op. cit., and Bamford, op. cit., Stanley, op. cit.

Comparisons on specific points may be made as follows:

It is said, in the quotation, that it was in the Sixth Form that boys first came to know Bradley at all well. For similar comments about Arnold see Stanley, op. cit., p. 138; Wymer, op. cit., pp. 107-110, passim; Bamford, op. cit., p. 86, together with almost every other writer on Arnold.

Bradley's defence of the Sixth Form on questions of discipline is almost identical to that of Arnold, as may be seen by consulting Bamford, op. cit., p. 86; Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 118 and 119 and many other commentators.

The fear and awe with which the small boys looked upon Bradley is also very much the emotions of the young Rugby boys, as can be seen in Wymer, op. cit., p. 110; Hughes, op. cit., p. 132; as well as other writers, including Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 138 and Oscar Browning, "Arnold and Arnoldism," Education, December, 1890, p. 309.

Arnold made a point of entertaining the senior boys in his home, and was criticised by many people for passing on his views in this way; see, for example, Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 172-3; "Memories of Arnold and Rugby Sixty Years Ago," The Parents' Review, Vol. VII, no: 2, p. 134; the Northampton Herald, February 21, 1835; and Bamford, op. cit., pp. 68-9 and 76-7.

It was in his home that the Rugby boys saw Arnold as a kind, gentle man, a picture very different from that which he presented in the school, and this is another of the characteristics of Bradley that Butcher mentions. Stanley, op. cit., Chapter III, passim and pp. 172-3 in particular, stresses this aspect of Arnold.

Butcher's comment that Bradley was more concerned with

arousing interest than in simply communicating his own knowledge is also a characteristic Arnoldian trait. See, for example, Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 140, 141 and 135.

For confirmation that Arnold too disliked laziness, rather than ignorance, see Stanley, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 132.

Stanley also stresses Arnold's restlessness, combative nature, his desire for exactness of scholarship and historical information, traits which Bradley shared. Ibid., Vol. I, Chapter III, passim.

The identification of the school with the headmaster is also seen clearly in both men. Stanley, says of Rugby, "Throughout, whether in the school itself, or in its after effects, the one image that we have before us is not Rugby, but ARNOLD." Ibid., p. 106.

⁹³1893 History, op. cit., p. 203.

⁹⁴See McIntosh, op. cit., p. 31.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 28.

Tuesday 28th
 You are not in the least surprised by my committing myself
 to a course of study. It is the last I think that
 you are likely to have at present. For though I have
 had some misadventure in the morning & so am not
 many books that I had had to give to it. I have
 sufficiently amused myself from the last evening
 having however found time to read the most
 lead. I cannot say of George Sand the most desirable
 French novel ever read. & not clearly only that
 which one has heard of the whole life of
 Madame de Sevigne is perfectly so far as it goes
 here in this respect. I have been inclined to believe
 her to be a creature among the best of the world
 de Paris & I considered that but for the fact
 that she was a Frenchman I should have been well
 with a collection of them. I have translated it and
 believe it would take for me the hero is
 an Englishman. It is a most curious little
 a very good kind of book. It is a

Friday 31st
 I have to thank the Rev. Mr. [Name] for the
 notice of the Rev. Mr. [Name] in the [Name]
 one of the Rev. Mr. [Name] in the [Name]
 he wrote in answer to my letter of the 28th that he was
 a candidate for a seat in the [Name] & was
 of course for the [Name] he did not vote for [Name]
 had been guilty of the most shameful behaviour towards
 the Rev. Mr. [Name] Peter. This guilt it appears appeared in
 something which occurred years ago when [Name]
 & [Name] & other [Name] had informed Peter who [Name]
 the Examiner had given some [Name] [Name] the [Name]
 which Peter conceived afterwards. He had not [Name] [Name]
 attributed his fault to [Name] [Name] after [Name]
 accident had been given. [Name] [Name] [Name]
 [Name] of it. Peter seems a sort of [Name] [Name]

CHAPTER VII

THE MINOR ARNOLDIANS

...the reforms at Rugby under Arnold ... permeated the whole mass of schools in the forties and fifties, so in the world of sport the practices in vogue at Rugby tended to be copied in other schools. Its game of football spread far and wide,

McIntosh.

In searching for material on many of the men who were either pupils or assistant masters under Arnold and who then continued to work in the field of education, one finds that there is little information readily available for many of them and none at all for a considerable number.¹ Those men who became famous like Cotton or Vaughan, have had a number of people write about them; letters they wrote have been preserved and the schools in which they worked have taken pride in preserving their memories. Most of the Rugby men were not of the stature of Cotton and Vaughan, so that records are correspondingly scarce, and in some cases fires, closure of the school and similar occurrences have caused the loss of any materials that were available.²

There are a number of men whose records are not extensive enough to determine whether or not they influenced the development of organised games in their schools. In many cases it is possible only to say that there is no evidence one way or the other. There are others where it is possible to hypothesise that they were unable to promote games, even if they were so inclined. For instance, Josiah Wright³ who was Headmaster of Sutton Coldfield Grammar School, 1849-1863, was able to promote the Classics, found prizes and start a library, all of which would have met with Arnold's approval, but, as there appears to have been no facilities for organised games available, he was unable to encourage them.

The men who had worked under Arnold seem to have made a speciality of taking over schools that were in poor straits and causing them to flourish. The Meteor, in 1893, contained an article in which

it was said that Edward Henry Bradby

... proved himself through many years of exhausting labour to be one of the best of English Schoolmasters, and as second headmaster of Haileybury he shared with the Rev. A. G. Butler the credit of building up one of the most useful of our new public schools.⁴

H. C. Bradby extolled his virtues rather more succinctly when he said that Edward H. Bradby "...guided Haileybury from infancy to full growth;"⁵ In the Haileyburian, when Dr. Bradby retired, it was said that "...he set to work to consolidate and systematise, to prune and to develop, and in all such development to pave the way for that greater extension which he felt to be inevitable." There is, however, no indication that he made any efforts to promote organised games.⁶

Most of the Rugby men remained as assistant masters throughout their lives and nothing is known of their work. Some, like John Edward Cooper,⁷ an assistant master at Repton, are not even mentioned in the official histories of their schools. There are others, for whom only circumstantial information is available. Such a man is George Cotterill for whom there is no direct evidence that he approved or disapproved of games, but who had a large family of sons, all of whom were prominent in sport. Cotterill was Second Master of Christ's College, Christchurch, New Zealand, and in charge of a house and it is known that organised games were developing during the period he was at Christ's College, so it would seem likely that he was actively engaged to some extent, but there is no proof.⁸

Even such well-established schools as Shrewsbury do not have records of the activities of most of the assistant masters during the

nineteenth century. It is possible to verify that a man like Henry Greenwood, for instance, was a master at Shrewsbury from February, 1855 to Midsummer, 1866 and to ascertain that he had academic connections with places like Queen's College, Lincoln College and Magdalen College at Oxford, as well as that he became Rector of Beelsby, in Lincolnshire after he left Shrewsbury; but it is impossible to discover whether he did anything towards promoting and developing organised games.⁹

It has been noted that men who had been assistants under Arnold, or who had been pupils at Rugby during his tenure, were much sought after as assistant masters and headmasters. This was not only the case in the period immediately after his death, but also for many years afterwards, as the fame of men like Vaughan, Cotton and Bradley spread, and as Rugby retained, and even improved upon, the reputation it had achieved under Arnold. At least one man who was appointed on the basis of his having been an assistant under, as well as a pupil of Arnold, failed to maintain the standards that had been set by some of his colleagues. When the Principalship of Cheltenham College fell vacant "there was an intense desire exhibited on the part of the directors, to have a Rugby man for Principal, and Mr. Highton, who had served under Arnold, being a candidate, no other was thought so well qualified for the office." In keeping with Arnold's beliefs, Highton demanded that he be "intrusted with the discipline and moral training of those he was to teach."¹⁰ It is known that cricket, which was well-established before Highton arrived, continued to flourish

during his short tenure,¹¹ (from 1859-62) but any efforts that he may have made in the area of organised games were overshadowed by the problems he encountered as Principal. Much of the trouble that Highton had at this time was due to the peculiar situation into which Cheltenham College had fallen. In the end, the constitution of the College was completely altered, but virtually the whole of Highton's tenure was spent in an atmosphere of acrimonious criticism and bitter recrimination which involved the whole town. Highton was a brilliant man with a creative mind who received the Medal of the Society of Arts for his discoveries with reference to electric telegraphs, but he was the wrong man in the wrong place at the wrong time. The result is that historians have dwelt on the problems of Highton's Principalship and neglected anything he may have done to promote games.¹²

Herbert Hill¹³ was appointed to the Mastership of Warwick School in 1842, the year of Arnold's death. He had been an assistant master at Rugby from 1836 to 1839. At Warwick School he found that the boys played rounders, prisoner's base, hockey, tip-cat and quoits in the playground, and football and cricket on the school playing fields. The school had a paid instructor for cricket, a Mr. Palethorpe, and Herbert Hill played with the boys. It was very unusual for a head-master to play cricket with the boys this early in the century, although many were to do so later. The boys also ran in cross-country paper-chases in the winter months. Hill obviously encouraged games, particularly cricket, but whether he was a strong Arnoldian is not known. Three years as an assistant master with Arnold was ample time in which to become imbued with Arnold's principles and methods,

especially as Hill was at Rugby at a time when Arnold had had several years in which to test his theories and settle on a reasonably permanent system. However, nothing is known of his attitude towards Arnold.

A man who was an avowed disciple of the Rugby headmaster, and who was not the type to play games with his boys, was James Prince Lee¹⁴ probably the best teacher to be at Rugby in the first half of the century. Arnold said of him, when Lee was applying for the position of headmaster of King Edward's School, Birmingham, "It is difficult for me to wish him success, because it would be next to impossible for me to supply his place adequately at Rugby" Arnold also stated that on the subject of Lee's scholarship "I feel it almost presumptuous in me to speak, because it is much superior to my own." It is said of James Prince Lee that

he served eight years at Rugby, during which time he drew nearer and nearer to Arnold, whom he greatly admired. . . . he even developed some of Arnold's mannerisms, gestures and expressions.

And undoubtedly he followed Arnold in attempting to form a corps d'elite of the boys in his boarding-house and in his own form on whom the whole tone of the school should depend.

Lee also adopted Arnold's method of asking parents to withdraw boys he considered unsuitable. Lee managed, despite the fact that the Birmingham school was largely a day-school, to achieve the same "tremendous seriousness, . . . intense enjoyment of work and an extraordinary enthusiasm for virtue" that marked Arnold's Sixth Form. Lee was also able, like Arnold, to see when boys were working too hard and to call a halt and suggest some relaxation. As a headmaster, Lee

was an unqualified success, by nineteenth century standards. In the nine and a half years of his headmastership Lee's pupils achieved a phenomenal amount of success in the academic world and showed a devotion to their headmaster that rivalled that of the Rugby contingent of Stanley, Vaughan, Clough and Lake to Arnold.

Lee, however, did not advocate playing games, or promote them in his school. The reasons for this are not clear, but it does seem certain that the fact that he suffered from ill-health all his life affected his views on physical activity. The other major reason for him not to promote games at Birmingham was that the school was, predominantly, a day school, and was situated in the heart of a rapidly growing, major industrial city. It is doubtful whether Lee would have promoted games even if the situation had been more conducive and even if his health had been good, but these were strong reasons for him not doing so.

In 1852 George Malin Messiter¹⁵ went, as an assistant master, to Repton. He was quite a contrast to Lee, having been Captain of Rugby as a boy under Arnold. He is described as being "manly, vigorous, kindly, hot-tempered, in all respects a pedagogue of the old school." Two years after Messiter arrived at Repton, a new headmaster was appointed who had a strong link with Rugby having just spent seven years at Harrow under Vaughan. Steuart Adolphus Pears, the incoming headmaster is described as the second founder of Repton, and he did at that school the same kind of job that Vaughan did at Harrow. It was during this renaissance that Messiter worked at Repton, as Second Master. Pears was a great believer in games and

"that healthy exertion of body and spirit together, which is found in the excitement, the emulation and the friendly strife of school games."

He had a number of fives courts built and

two or three times a week, Messiter could be seen enjoying himself to the full, bounding about the Court, shouting with excitement and delivering his celebrated left-hand drives which came with a jerk, apparently from his left hip.

Football was an old-established sport at Repton by the 1850's, but during Messiter's time the rules were changed and the numbers of players considerably reduced. A primitive form of hockey was played and cricket vied with swimming and rowing for prominence in the summer months, while paper-chases kept the boys busy in the spring-time.

The games of the school flourished throughout the whole period that Messiter was at Repton, but while there is ample evidence that Pears, the headmaster, promoted them strenuously, even to the extent of playing in the school cricket team, there is no evidence at all that Messiter did anything to help the growth of any of the sports. It would seem most likely, with his background, that he did, but there is nothing to support the supposition.

It is possible to hypothesise that some of the men from Rugby did not promote organised games because of the locale in which they worked or because of the size of the school. The Rev. J. H. Moor,¹⁶ for instance, who was Master of Kingsbridge School in Devon, had charge of a small school in an area in which organised games did not begin to develop until about 1880, and Moor died in 1856. The Rev. Moor had a particularly strong association with Rugby School as not

only was he a pupil from 1823 to 1834, having entered at age six, but his father was an assistant master at the school from 1800 to 1831. Moor was a member of the Rugby cricket XI in 1834, so he had some background in games, but the position that he took up gave him no opportunity to do much in the way of promoting them. Edward St. John Parry¹⁷ was in a similar position, in that the school to which he went as Warden in the 1850's, the Queen's College, was situated in the centre of Birmingham and it is unlikely that there were any facilities for games at all.

The problem of obtaining information on the Rugby men is most difficult in the cases of assistant masters. Often there is some record of the life and work of a headmaster, but much more rarely of an assistant. Even where an obituary is available, it is usually impersonal and gives no more than an account of the man's academic achievements and the positions he held, so that it is impossible to decide with any accuracy the part he may have played in the games of the boys. Such is the case, for instance, with William T. Newman¹⁸ who was at Cheltenham College for twenty-five years, from 1847 to 1872. The Cheltonian for August 1876 records his death and gives a short description of his life, but the personal details are few and give no help in deciding what, if any, part he might have played in promoting games.

There are men who, rather like Arnold, were headmasters of schools in which games flourished, but of whom there is no direct evidence that they were personally involved in their promotion. Such a man was the Rev. John Penrose,¹⁹ who is an extremely interesting man in his own right, and warrants much more investigation. He was the

son of Elizabeth Penrose, whose children's books, written under the name of Mrs. Markham, had made her famous, and who was sister-in-law to Thomas Arnold. At Exmouth School, where Penrose was headmaster from 1846 to 1871, the boys had a hard life, but did have a daily session in which they played games. The boys rose at dawn in the winter and at six o'clock in the summer and then spent two hours in the classroom before breakfast, after which they had their games interval, when they raced, played prisoner's base, rounders, cricket or hand-fives on a playground that was either gritty gravel or soft slush. There was a cricket ground a short distance from the school, but it was a very rough expanse of field where the boys also dug out small gardens, with primitive tools.

Henry Cook, who was second master under Penrose, and "Lob" Miller, who was third master and who acquired his nickname because of his inability to master the new overarm bowling that reached Exmouth School in his time, were both interested in and worked hard to promote games in the school. Penrose must have given his consent to their labours and to the place that games held in the school. One of Penrose's pupils, Edward B. Michell, won three amateur boxing championships at different weights: light, middle and heavy, and was also winner of the Diamond and Wingfield Sculls and other trophies. He was never beaten in the boxing ring and was known as the amateur rowing champion of the world. The world, at that time, comprised the Thames, the Severn, the Clyde and the Ouse rivers, as far as the rowing fraternity was concerned. Other famous rowers came from the school in Penrose's time, including Sir Theodore A. Cook, J. H.

Ridley, H. Tremayne, R. Martin and Charles Ridley Carr.

Penrose's personal physical activities were rowing, sailing and fishing. He was an expert fly-fisherman and spent many hours on the River Otter. It was his fishing that ultimately caused his death. In 1888, seventeen years after retiring from the school, he went to Norway on a fishing trip and caught a salmon which aroused his pride to the extent that he decided to send it to his beloved school. To ensure that the trophy was started safely on its journey he ferried it across a fjord to a coasting steamer. On the trip he caught a chill and the school learned of his death before they received the salmon.

Penrose's Rugby background shows in the fact that he was concerned with inculcating "character" into his boys and with educating them in the Classics. He was the author of a standard work in the area of his major interest, Latin verse, which was published under the title of Penrose's Latin Verse. Like Arnold, he was a believer in the use of the Classics and in flogging. His favourite instrument for punishment was a horsewhip, which was applied, vigourously, to the hands of the delinquent boys. It is easy to believe that he thought that the boys' characters would be strengthened by their participation in sports and games, because of his work in trying to build character and the fact that games obviously played a large part in the life of the school. There is, however, no direct evidence to support such a conclusion.

Another man who was headmaster of a school in which games played a prominent part but who has left no record of any direct, personal interest in them, is Henry Walford, who was headmaster of St. Nicolas' College, Lancing, from 1857 to 1859, and later moved to

Haileybury as an assistant master, where he remained for twenty years. Walford was a member of the Rugby cricket XI in 1841 and it is said that 1857, the year he arrived at Lancing, "must be regarded as the date of the foundation of Lancing cricket."²⁰ At this time the Lancing boys had the assistance of two professional cricketers, Browne and Wells, who occasionally played for Sussex. An assistant master, a man named Raymond, was coach for the team during Walford's short stay as headmaster, and for years afterwards, and he must have had Walford's consent to devote his energies to the improvement of the game. It is known that Walford continued to be interested in cricket as it is said of him, years later when he was at Haileybury, that

the Wellington XI were much impressed one year on being told that the tall, white-bearded clergyman who was watching the match so intently under the big umbrella was 'Walford' of 'Walford's Cicero.'²¹

The boys at Lancing, in the late fifties, played two separate games of football and also played whatever rules their opponents used when playing away from home. Apart from football and cricket the boys swam in the river, ran in paper-chases, competed in athletic sports and amused themselves with a six-oared boat in the creek.

Once again, however, apart from consenting to games and to masters being involved in them, and a personal interest that extended to watching the boys play, there is no evidence as to Walford's views on organised games or their uses within the school situation.

There are some assistant masters whose names have lived on as being interested in promoting games, although no details have

survived. Such a man is William John Bull who was at Harrow from 1853 to 1888. Bull himself played rackets, was a member of the Volunteer Movement and was a fisherman and mountain-climber. Of him it was said he "showed an unfailing interest in the Athletic side of School life."²² This, however, is the extent of the relevant information.

There is evidence, although often slight, that some of the headmasters were actively interested in the games their pupils played. John Robert Crawford, for instance, who became Headmaster of Berkhamsted Grammar School in 1850, was determined to build up the school and to encourage the games aspect of the boys' life.

There is certainly evidence that he tried to promote organised games and that he himself played both cricket and football with the boys until he was struck by a wasting illness before his plans for many improvements could mature.²³

The wasting illness cut short his life and he died in 1863 at the age of forty-six. Before his death

he had plans for extending the accommodation for boarders in order to foster growth of the school & certainly he planned to encourage organised games by trying to get better playing grounds.

The Rev. Edwards Bartram, who was Crawford's successor, reaped the benefits of his predecessor's work. In Crawford's time the boys played cricket on a ground about half a mile from the school on an open patch of the common, and a "peculiar and non-descript type" of football in the Castle grounds.

These were the main games played & there is ample evidence of Crawford's participation in them & encouragement of them. Some of Crawford's sons became outstanding games players & athletes.

While there is evidence that Crawford actively promoted games, there

is less knowledge of his connection with Arnold and how much he tried to emulate him. It is known that he was at Rugby from 1830 to about 1835, which was long enough for him to have known Arnold well.

William Gover is a man whose affiliation to Arnold and Arnold's methods is known.

In 1835 he was sent to Rugby School under Dr. Arnold--a school he loved and a Headmaster for whom he had the greatest respect and admiration. He introduced many of Arnold's aims and beliefs into Saltley (Training College), and in so doing infused the men with the spirit of comradeship and the bond of brotherhood, which still live as part of the Saltley tradition. In his book 'Memoirs of Arnold and Rugby,' Canon Gover ... tells how, though being ignorant of horse-racing and betting, he was unwittingly involved in a sweepstake, and actually gained the sum of 'four half-crowns.'²⁴

On taking up his post as the first Principal of Saltley in 1851 he is recorded as saying: "I determined that I would endeavour to carry out Arnold's principles."²⁵

The fact that Gover was a devotee of Arnold is certainly thought to have been one of the causes that made games popular at the College. It has been said that "...Mr. Gover was very strongly influenced by Dr. Arnold at Rugby when he became Principal at this College. Among other things, this enabled him to establish both football and cricket as recreational activities." The same authority says that:

Certainly during the recreation periods football was encouraged and there is a reference to gymnastics which seems to be some form of athletics. The first reference to other kinds of drill was the establishment of military drill with the voluntary corps which was established in 1854. This enabled rifle shooting to be put on the recreations and there were annual weeks in camp. The first reference to an athletics meeting is a sports day originating in 1875. This included an exhibition of army drill and firing exercises. There was also a senior versus junior tug-o-war.²⁶

The Annual Reports of the Committee of Governors, which Canon Gover prepared, show that he was greatly concerned with the physical health and well-being of the students in his care, of whom he said:

Contrasted with those of nearly their own age in our public schools, nothing is more striking, when they first enter the College, than their want of knowledge and practice of healthy athletic sports,²⁷

Despite his emphasis on the physical benefits accruing from sports and other forms of activity, such as gardening and military drill, Gover thought that games helped to "secure that healthy development of the physical and mental powers so desirable in candidates for training."²⁸ Although the College was in financial difficulties in 1859 he managed to secure two acres of land for use as "an excellent ground for cricket and football (which) is no trivial gain to the well-being both of Students and the Institution."²⁹

Gover's views on physical activity were coloured by the nature of the work that the students in his College were going to do, by the locale in which the College was set and by the condition of the students when they came to the College. The fact that the boys came from schools where their physical health had been neglected; that they had often been pupil teachers and therefore cut off from the activities of the other boys in the school; and that many of them would go out to teach in industrial areas where exercise would be difficult, or in rural areas where a knowledge of horticulture would be of much greater benefit than skill at cricket, all combined to cause Canon Gover to rate drill and gardening higher, and football and cricket lower, than he might have done had his situation been different. Nevertheless, it is certain that he was

prepared to sacrifice other material gains in order that the prospective teachers should have a playing field and that football was an important part of the school's activities, to the extent that on at least one occasion one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools participated in the game.³⁰

It has been said that a number of Rugby men were sought after when schools were in difficulties and that in a number of cases, notably those of Cotton and Vaughan, they were successful in raising the fortunes of the institutions. There is at least one instance of a man who went to a school that was flourishing and which declined under his care. The Rev. Charles Thomas Penrose, brother of John Penrose, Headmaster of Exmouth School, and son of Elizabeth Penrose, went to Sherborne School in 1845 at the early age of twenty-nine. Penrose seemed to have every possible advantage: he was young, vigorous, a rowing blue, a Bell Scholar and a classicist of renown. He had been an under-master at Oakham and headmaster of Grosvenor College, Bath. His athletic prowess was such that he not only rowed for Cambridge in 1837, 1838 and 1839, but had been a member of the Rugby cricket XI in 1832, 1833, 1834 and 1835. In all ways he seemed the ideal choice for Sherborne.

Penrose's scholarship was first rate and he was known to possess the other necessary qualities, for he had already proved himself kind and friendly to boys, generous and accessible to his colleagues, yet when necessary a firm and just disciplinarian. His associations with Arnold, already even at that time almost a legend, probably tipped the scales in his favour.³¹

Initially Penrose fulfilled the expectations that were held of him, and it was obvious that Sherborne had a sensible, practical man at the helm. Very soon, however, Penrose succumbed to an illness which gave

him no strength and energy for the school and most of his work devolved upon the usher. Consequently the numbers in the school fell off considerably and Penrose's five years can only be described as a period of failure. Eventually Penrose, who was popular and well-respected both in the school and the town, resigned. His tenure was followed by a period of great prosperity for the school.

Although Penrose will be remembered as a failure, perhaps his most outstanding memorial will be used to counterbalance that verdict. "Above all, in 1846 he introduced football from Rugby, thus giving Sherborne a long start in the tradition of the game, which was but little played in schools at that time."³² Whether all the boys, or indeed, how many of the boys played the game in Penrose's time is not sure, but he evidently gave them the opportunity as he says "they are always allowed to go to the field, when the weather is fine, once a day."³³

The year following Penrose's appointment the school played its first cricket game against another school:

In 1846 comes the first school fixture, v Bruton, played at Sherborne. A very full account describes a large crowd of parents and other supporters and mentions 'round arm bowling' and pretty specimens of 'forward play, the cut to the off and the hit to leg.' More important, we get the detailed score and the composition of the first of all Sherborne elevens. Bruton won, but only by virtue of the prowess of a master whom they had included in their team, a tactic not appreciated by the home side. However an excellent dinner given by Penrose in a marquee on the ground and an easy victory at fives thereafter back at the school court smoothed over the incident. The fixture was to become an annual one which lasted some years. In September 1851 Sherborne won--and were in their turn criticised for having procured some professional coaching for their side.³⁴

Apparently the school was in a transitional stage, with both Barbarian and Philistine elements present as the boys in Penrose's time not only played football fives and cricket and games like prisoner's base or marbles, but also took their guns and ferrets and caught "pheasant or the like" which they took to a local shop to be made into pies.³⁵ It is doubtful whether Penrose managed to change the boys' habits very much during his tenure, although he might well have done more had his illness not caused him to be less efficient than he would otherwise have been. The fact that he introduced the Rugby form of football shows that he was prepared to promote games in his school, but there is no evidence to show what his feelings towards Arnold were, although he was probably sent to Rugby because of his family connection with the headmaster.

The men who had been at Rugby with Arnold went to many different kinds of school and one, Edward Henry Price, established what proved to be a leading preparatory school, Philberd's School, at Maidenhead. Unfortunately the school ceased operations many years ago and even the buildings were destroyed in 1922. However, it is believed that Price, who was a pioneer of middle-class education and was prominent in the field of athletics, did promote cricket and football during his tenure.³⁶

The number of Arnold's Old Boys who became schoolmasters is great, but just how great is uncertain. John Day Collis³⁷ who became Headmaster of Bromsgrove School in January 1843 is recorded as having said that of the thirty boys in the Sixth Form at Rugby in 1834 he and seventeen others became schoolmasters. If this number were

typical of all of the Sixth Forms under Arnold then the total could be as high as two hundred, or even more.

Collis was a remarkable man who had won every University prize for Hebrew studies while a Fellow at Oxford. When he came to Bromsgrove he was only twenty-seven but already had a distinguished record as a linguistic and philological scholar and teacher. He was a man of immense vitality who had many interests. He was tall, handsome and dignified, fond of good wine and high living and a fine horseman who took his great shaggy staghound with him when he went riding, which terrorised all the small boys.

Fives or possibly rackets was played at Bromsgrove during Collis' tenure and he had a Corps of Cadets who drilled on the playground. The playground itself Collis found necessary to enclose with a wall which was eight feet high and intended to keep the school boys in and the town boys out. Rugby football was played at the school although it is not stated when it was introduced. The game was, however, the Big Side game of Rugby, such as was played during Collis' time at Rugby and is described in Tom Brown's School-days. It has been said that the School fought a regular battle and fought to win in these games.

The Doctor himself occasionally took part in the game. 'He was a plump man and was fond of catching the ball on the bounce. But he never ran. He stood stock still with the ball in his arms, and the players swarmed round him like bees. In due course things became serious for Dr. Collis and cries would be heard from the centre of the scrimmage--till the Doctor dropped the ball.³⁸

All the games were intra-mural at this time, mainly because each school played its own rules. One exception to the general rule was provided in the early sixties when the School played a local village

team comprised of burly blacksmiths, gamekeepers and the curate, a muscular man!

Outside matches in cricket were, however, commonplace, although most were against local clubs, rather than other schools, or against teams representing country houses. One such house was called Hagley and,

in his address at Commemoration in 1913 Mr. Alfred Lyttelton recalled some of his own earliest memories of Bromsgrove boys of the sixties. 'We at Hagley looked on Bromsgrove as a place where there were cricket fields, and where there were boys, both small and great, who were splendid playfellows at cricket. Even now I can recall the names of some of the heroes of those days-- "misty warriors dimly seen"--Daubeney and Cator, who were members of one of the best elevens Oxford ever turned out; Gordon and Penny, the latter one of the best left-handed bowlers it was ever my misfortune to play. The boys came over to Hagley once a year, and when, I think, I was nine years old, I had the incredible glory of scoring 14 in a match against the School.'³⁹

The match mentioned here was played in 1867, Collis' last year and was, by all accounts a wonderful day with some excellent cricket, when "long hits were made, fours, fives and even sixes were obtained."⁴⁰

Collis definitely promoted games in his school, although his motives for so doing are not obvious. In a number of ways he showed that he had inherited some of Arnold's ideas. His treatment of the "Blue Boys" the local children who were on the foundation, was very similar to that of Arnold at Rugby. Both men tried to eradicate the boys. Collis provided studies for the boys on the same lines as Arnold had done at Rugby, a move which was not made in most schools for several years. He followed the general pattern of the Rugby time-table as it had been in Arnold's time, so that it was, basically, a classical curriculum. How deeply imbued with Arnold's ideas, he was, however, it is impossible to say.

The problems that both Arnold and Collis had with the boys on their schools' foundations and the solutions they tried to find to those problems led to acrimonious disputes over the boys' rights. In Arnold's case he lost the support of the one man who had befriended him up to that point. This was Wratislaw, a solicitor in the town, and the father of five boys, the eldest of whom, Albert Henry Wratislaw was withdrawn from the school in 1836 as a result of the dispute. In 1852 the son became Headmaster at Felsted School.

Wratislaw started at once to make it a little Rugby. . . . Though none of them were yet in their teens, prefects were appointed. Cricket began on Squire's Little Field, changing in the autumn to Rugby football, then still a primitive game. A drill sergeant came over from Chelmsford; if it was too wet to drill, they boxed in the Schoolroom. They even chanced athletic sports that first November, of all months. . . .

We gather that there were heats and finals and prizes, and that the events included quarter-mile, half-mile and a walking match.⁴¹

In the year following his appointment Wratislaw rented a bathing-place which the school had used in the past and a swimming-test was re-introduced. Boys who passed the test were then allowed to bathe without supervision.

In 1854 the school team played its first cricket match. The game was against the village team and the young players from the school only lost by two runs. Later that year the school team played its first inter-school match, against Brentwood school, and scored an easy victory. No doubt their win was attributable to a large extent to the services of their professional, a man named Mariner. The boys were also helped to improve their game by the purchase, in 1854, of a playing field of four and a half acres.

Felsted school was in financial difficulties at this time, but the Trustees had agreed to re-build the school, which would, it was thought, furnish it with the necessary stimulus to overcome the problems. Such a scheme required considerable courage, however. There was always the chance that good money was being sent after bad and that the school would never repay the considerable outlay that was required. In any case the Trustees lost their courage and decided upon a compromise of extending the present buildings. Wratislaw therefore resigned and accepted the position of Headmaster of Bury St. Edmunds School.

Wratislaw was a great classical scholar, but was even better known for his expertise in Slavonic languages, particularly Czech. He was also very knowledgeable about natural history, especially entomology and botany. He married twice and had a total of thirteen children during his tenure at Bury St. Edmunds which lasted for twenty-four years. Despite his father's quarrel with Arnold, and his own early removal from Rugby, Wratislaw does not seem to have harboured a grudge against his old school and was an Examiner there in 1849 and 1850. More curious, however, considering his background, Wratislaw does not seem to have been very sympathetic to the claims of the local boys for the free education, or cheap education that they had enjoyed since 1550.

Wratislaw had strong views on what was wrong. In June, 1874, he reported to the Governors: 'As it is the school is simply starved by the small payments of the Royalists.'⁴²

The Royalists were the boys from the town, (those from outside being

known as "foreigners,") and Wratislaw, as a boy, had been the Rugby equivalent of a Royalist.

As well as being an examiner at Rugby, Wratislaw had ambitions to the headmastership, for which he applied in 1869. In the Minutes of the Meetings of the Governors for November 2, 1869, there appears a copy of the letter the Governors of the Bury School sent to the Trustees of Rugby. In this letter the Governors reported that Wratislaw had taken over their school when it was at a low ebb, numerically, and had enabled it to regain its former standard and to maintain it. The headmaster, they said, was an excellent Classical Scholar, had a good acquaintance with Modern Languages, was a good teacher who maintained high discipline and moral tone.⁴³

The picture drawn by the Governors differs somewhat from that of one of the masters in the school, the Rev. G. H. Statham,⁴⁴ who records in his personal diary that Wratislaw was "no disciplinarian" upon whom the boys could easily impose. He also says that the headmaster was unmannerly in some respects and did not give sufficient care in selecting the boys he allowed into the school and the house. Statham does admit that Wratislaw was a man of great intellect who could take up any subject by the mere force of his brain power; that he was an excellent teacher, a most accurate scholar who turned out many good men from the school; that he was a good Christian and a staunch friend, a Broad Churchman and a Liberal. He also praises Wratislaw's abilities as an entomologist noting that he bought land and raised strange bushes and at least one rare moth. Statham, who could hardly be described as modest, stresses his own abilities on the sports' fields,

but does not suggest that his headmaster was a games-player.

Even if he were not a player himself, it is certain that Wratislaw considered games an important part of school life, including inter-school matches. The pleasure at one of these trips is remembered by one boy who says, "We played against Norwich, and I recall the delight of starting at 6 a.m. in an open truck, furnished with forms, on a bright summer's morning."⁴⁵ The Proceedings of the Governors of the school contain several copies of letters from Wratislaw to the Governors regarding games in one form or another. In September 1862, Wratislaw asked the Governors for a change in the school hours because the present ones "...deprive the Boys of their fair share of air and exercise, which are quite as important to them as Lessons," In 1876 the headmaster was arguing against the purchase of a proposed field for cricket, but only on the grounds that the particular plot was too far from the school. Twenty years before that, within a year of taking office, in a letter dated November 4, 1856, Wratislaw had asked for part of the paddock to be used as a playground.

There is, however, surprisingly little information on the games of Wratislaw's long tenure. It is known that football was played and that some of the boys were deputed to obtain a bullock's bladder from the butcher, wash it, blow it up and insert it into the leather case. Cricket was also played, and the boys participated in the usual minor games of the time. Wratislaw rented a cricket ground, for which, in 1871 the Governors contributed ten pounds.

Wratislaw's predecessor, Dr. Donaldson "...was a firm believer in the practical carrying out of Dr. Arnold's principles and

system and he left jurisdiction and judgment to his VIth Form boys."⁴⁶ Donaldson believed, with Arnold, that one should trust boys and it is said that none of his boys would have lied to him. Wratislaw, then, had an inheritance which strongly favoured the use of Arnold's methods. The Governor's Proceedings suggest that he had some of the same aims as his old headmaster. During 1855, for example, there are records of Wratislaw asking for increases in salary for his assistant masters. The following year the Governors were called upon to help a parent who said that Wratislaw had promised that flogging would be reserved for grave offences only, such as lying and theft, and even then only with the knowledge of the parent. The boy had refused corporal punishment and the headmaster was, apparently, trying to expel him. In 1858 the local Vicar raised a considerable fuss over some of the school boys who, according to the Vicar, were smoking pipes in public. The incident was discussed at length over a period of time, and eventually the Vicar dropped his charges against the moral tone of the school. In itself this is not too important, but it gave Wratislaw the opportunity to voice his opinion on the subject of expulsion. He is reported in the Minutes of the meeting held on November 26, 1858 as saying that he expelled boys from his own House when occasion demanded it, but he did not have the power to do so in the case of the day boys, and asked that the Governors exercise their prerogative in this respect and expel any boys whose morals were so low as to adversely affect the school.

There is, then, evidence that Wratislaw adopted Arnold's

methods and that he promoted games in the school. Particular points of agreement between Wratislaw and Arnold can be seen in his views on flogging, expulsion, the status of assistant masters, and the seriousness of lying. There is no avowed link in his beliefs and those of Arnold and it is impossible to say just how much his old headmaster did affect his thinking. One would expect that he would not have been sympathetic to Arnold as a man, although his views on the Church and on politics were very similar. Despite being a foundationer at Rugby his ideas were quite like those of Arnold and he does not seem to have had the sympathy for the local boys that one would expect considering his own background, his father's struggle with Arnold and his own removal from Rugby.

In all, the records of the men who worked with Arnold or who were pupils under him do not help to determine Arnold's views on the use of organised games. There are a great number of such men, but information on them is limited and that which is available suggests that there is a wide variety of beliefs and practices among them with no discernible pattern which could be attributed to Arnold. If there is a preponderance of men who thought that games were an essential part of school life this could as easily have been a reflection of the ethos of the times as anything they learned from Arnold.

The major figures, Cotton, Vaughan and Bradley give some credence to the belief that Arnold saw possible benefits accruing from games, especially as both Cotton and Vaughan were not games-players themselves but promoted them in their schools. It seems most likely

that it was the benefits of keeping boys from participating in the rural, Barbarian activities, and of imposing some stronger discipline and a closer watch on them that were most attractive to the Marlborough men and to Vaughan. It is highly probable that this was also Arnold's view, and that none of these headmasters saw organised games as character-building mechanisms. However, the evidence, even from the three major Arnoldians, is far from conclusive, and the overall picture obtained from the minor Arnoldians who could be traced is insufficiently clear for any definitive statements to be made.

NOTES

¹For instance, a number of these men are mentioned in School magazines, usually in the form of an obituary, but the notices are often short, were probably written by somebody who had no personal knowledge of the man and often written several years after the man had retired. Some information has been found on the following, for instance, but none of it bears on their work as far as games is concerned:

Anstey, Charles Alleyne, see The Meteor, October 8, 1881, pp. 116-8.

Arnold, Charles Thomas, see The Meteor, May 28, 1878.

Brereton, Joseph Lloyd, see The Meteor, October 16, 1901.

Buckoll, Henry James, see The Meteor, June 20, 1871, p. 159.

Gantillon, Rev. Peter John Francis, see Cheltenham College Register, p. xxxvii, and The Cheltonian, April, 1906, p. 80.

Simpkinson, John Nassau, see The Meteor, May 26, 1894, p. 45, and The Harrovian, Tuesday May 8, 1894, Vol. VII, No: 3, p. 31.

Collis, John Day, see The Meteor, April 9, 1879, p. 44.

Price, Bonamy, see The Meteor, February 7, 1888, pp. 9-10.

²There are a number of cases of this nature, for instance, Charles James Sale became Head Teacher of the State School in Kanieri, New Zealand, but about 1935 a fire destroyed the school and all its contents, and there are now no records predating this year: Personal correspondence from Mr. B. A. Nyhof, Headmaster of the school at Kanieri, dated 23rd April, 1971. Similarly, Dawson William Turner took the position of Headmaster of the Royal Institution School in Liverpool, but the school was closed in 1892 and there are no records extant. Personal correspondence, Mr. D. S. Bland, Deputy Director, The Institute of Extension Studies, Royal Institution, Liverpool, dated April 20, 1971. John Day Collis founded Trinity College School which lasted only a few years. Personal correspondence, Mr. N. S. Pratt, Headmaster, King Edward VI School, Stratford-upon-Avon, dated April 28, 1971. Reginald Guy Bryan, who was the Principal of the College at Malta, has left no records because the College lapsed into ruin after his time there. Personal correspondence, from the Rev. Bernard Rickett, Headmaster of St. Edward's College, Malta, 7th May, 1971.

³Information on Josiah Wright comes mainly from personal correspondence from Messrs. Eddowes, Perry and Osbourne, solicitors of Sutton Coldfield, dated April 26, 1971, and from The Meteor, June 13, 1894, p. 54.

⁴The Meteor, December 20, 1893, p. 143. The obituary is written by Dr. Percival.

⁵H. C. Bradby, Rugby (London: George Bell & Sons, 1900), p. 73.

⁶The quotation from the Haileyburian is reproduced in personal correspondence from Mr. W. Stewart, Master of Haileybury College, dated May 7, 1971. See also The Harrovian, Vol. VI, No: 9, Thursday, December 14, 1893, pp. 103-4, an obituary entitled, "In Memoriam: Rev. E. H. Bradby," written by R. Bosworth Smith.

⁷Bernard Thomas ed. Repton, 1557 to 1957 (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1957).

⁸Personal communication from Mr. P. H. Williams, Second Master, Christ's College, Christchurch, New Zealand, dated May 18, 1971.

⁹Personal communication from Mr. J. B. Lawson, the librarian of Shrewsbury School, dated April 21, 1971.

¹⁰An Old Cheltonian, Reminiscences of Cheltenham College (London: Bemrose & Sons., 1868), pp. 160-1.

¹¹A. A. Hunter, Records of Cheltenham College Matches against Public Schools, 1856-1900 (Cheltenham: John Darter, 1901), pp. 10-11.

¹²See M. C. Morgan, Cheltenham College: The First Hundred Years (Chalfont St. Giles: Richard Sadler, 1968), pp. 31-41 for an account of Highton's tenure and the problems he encountered. See also The Meteor, No: 87, February 6, 1874, p. 315, for an account of Highton's Life. See also the Cheltenham College Register, 1841-1951, p. xxx; A. A. Hunter, Cheltenham College Register, 1841-1889 (London: George Bell & Sons, 1890), p. 4; Anon. The Jubilee of Cheltenham College, 1891 (Cheltenham: John Darter, 1891); and the Cheltonian, 2nd. Series, Vol. I, January, 1875, p. 114. Various issues of Looker On, the local newspaper of the time have accounts of the town's interest in the fortunes of the College between 1859 and 1861. There are also records kept by the College which contain a "Digest of a Special General Meeting, 1861." A letter of Dr. Highton is cited which "tears to bits, seriatim, the charges contained in 'Statement of Facts & Circumstances.'" This statement was a serious attack on Highton's competency as a Principal.

¹³The information on Herbert Hill was sent to the writer by Mr. P. W. Martin, Headmaster of Warwick School, in a letter dated April 21, 1971. Mr. Martin's source of information was A. F. Leach, History of Warwick School (London(?): Constable & Co., 1906).

¹⁴All the facts given here on James Prince Lee are taken from David Newsome Godliness and Good Learning (London: John Murray, 1961), pp. 91-118. The quotations, in the order they appear in the text, are from pp. 97; 98; 96; 110. Mr. Newsome, the author, and Mr. R. G. Lunt, the present Headmaster of the King Edward's School, confirm that there is no further information on Lee available other than that contained in Newsome's book. Personal correspondence dated June 30, 1971 and June 17, 1971 respectively.

¹⁵All the information presented here on Messiter (and Pears) is to be found in Bernard Thomas, ed., Repton, 1557 to 1957 (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1957), pp. 25-41. The quotations, in the order they appear in this text are from: pp. 41; 33; ibid.

The records and archives at Repton contain no further information on Messiter--personal correspondence from Mr. J. F. Gammell, Headmaster, Repton School, dated May 18, 1971.

¹⁶The lack of evidence for Moor's promotion of games, and the possibility that he would have found it difficult, if not impossible, is verified by personal correspondence from Miss Margaret E. Lorenz, Headmistress of Kingsbridge School, dated May 10, 1971.

¹⁷Personal correspondence from the Principal, the Rev. Canon J. S. Habgood, The Queen's College, Birmingham, dated April 19, 1971. See also The Meteor, No: 356, October 10, 1899, p. 112.

¹⁸See The Cheltonian, August 1876, p. 294. See also The Cheltenham College Register, 1841-1927, ed. E. Scot Skirving, (Cheltenham: The College, 1928), p. xxxv.

¹⁹All the information on the Rev. John Penrose is from a personal communication from Mr. R. S. Bagshaw, clerk and solicitor of Exmouth Urban District Council. The data were collected and written up by the editor of a local newspaper. Mr. Bagshaw's letter is dated 21 June, 1971.

The fact that there is no further information available on Penrose is verified by Mr. P. E. Thorne, Headmaster of Exmouth School, personal communication, dated April 28, 1971.

²⁰B. W. T. Handford, Lancing, 1848-1930 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1933), p. 89. The writer is indebted to Mr. Handford for his assistance in obtaining information on the games at Lancing at this period. Personal correspondence dated January 9, 1971 and undated correspondence from 1970.

²¹Personal correspondence, from the Master, Haileybury College, dated May 7, 1971. Mr. W. Stewart is quoting from L. S. Milford, Haileybury College, but does not give the page number. See also The Meteor, February 10, 1894, p. 10.

²²The Harrovian, Vol. III, No: 1, Thursday, February 13, 1890, p. 4.
See also The Meteor, February 22, 1890, p. 22.

²³All the information on John Robert Crawford was obtained by personal correspondence from Colonel A. L. Wilson, of Berkhamsted, (who is currently engaged in preparing an authoritative history of Berkhamsted School), dated April 23, 1971. All quotations are taken from this letter.

²⁴Anon, "The Principals of Saltley College," a publication of Saltley College, pp. 77-9.

Further information, which was used to prepare this section on Canon Gover, was received by personal correspondence with Mr. Charles Smith, of Saltley College, and Mr. C. S. Allatt, Senior Lecturer of the Physical Education Department of the College. Mr. Allatt also provided copies of extracts from the Annual Reports of the Committee of Governors, which were prepared by Canon Gover. The Revd., C. Buckmaster, Principal of the College, was instrumental in having the information sent to the writer. Correspondence dated May 11 and April 20, 1971.

St. Peter's College, Saltley, Birmingham, commonly known as "Saltley College," is a teachers' training college, as it has been since its inception, and has a very high reputation which dates from Canon Gover's time.

²⁵Ibid., p. 78.

See also The Meteor, December 21, 1896, p. 157.

²⁶Personal correspondence, Mr. Charles Smith, dated April 20, 1971.

²⁷Annual Report of the Committee of Governors for October 21, 1862, p. 8.

²⁸Ibid. See also Annual Reports of the Committee of Governors for October 23, 1856 and October 20, 1853 for other comments by Gover on the worth of horticulture and drill.

²⁹Annual Report of the Committee of Governors for October 20, 1859, p. 7.

³⁰Personal correspondence from Mr. C. S. Allatt, op. cit., who cites as his authority the Souvenir Saltley College, 1898.

³¹All the data on Charles T. Penrose are taken from A. B. Gourlay, A History of Sherborne School (Dorset: Sawtells of Sherborne Ltd., 1971). The quotation is taken from p. 110. This history of the school was brought to the writer's attention by the headmaster of Sherborne School, Mr. D. A. Emms, in a personal letter dated May 25, 1971.

³²Gourlay, op. cit., p. 111.

³³Ibid., p. 235. Gourlay does not say from whence he takes the quotation.

³⁴Ibid., p. 243.

³⁵Ibid., p. 303.

³⁶Personal correspondence from Major Hubert Martineau and Miss Mary L. Cross, dated April 26, 1971.

³⁷All the information given here on Collis is taken from H. E. M. Icely, Bromsgrove School Through Four Centuries (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953). The Headmaster and the Registrar of Bromsgrove School have verified that the School has no more information on Collis than appears in this volume. Personal correspondence dated June 15, 1971.

³⁸Icely, op. cit., p. 75.

³⁹Ibid., p. 77.

⁴⁰Ibid., Icely is quoting The Messenger, a local newspaper.

⁴¹Michael Craze, A History of Felsted School, 1564-1947 (Ipswich: Cowell, 1955), pp. 158-9.

Personal correspondence from Mr. A. F. Eggleston, Headmaster of Felsted School, dated May 3, 1971, and from Mr. Michael Craze, the author of the school's history, dated June 19, 1971, confirm that all the information that is available on Wratishlaw during his tenure at Felsted is included in the history.

⁴²R. W. Elliot, The Story of King Edward VI School, Bury St. Edmunds (Published by the Foundation Governors of the School, 1963), p. 120. The writer is indebted to Mr. Elliot for assistance in finding relevant documents in the local Archives, and to Mr. D. J. Pullan, the present headmaster of King Edward VI School for the opportunity to examine the records kept at the school.

⁴³Bury St. Edmunds Free Grammar School. Register of the Proceedings of the Governors--27th January 1831 to 26th February 1940, in three volumes. Presently the Proceedings are kept in the Muniments Room of the Town Archives.

⁴⁴Diaries of the Rev. G. H. Statham. The diaries are in the possession of the Statham family and the writer is indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Statham for allowing him access to them.

⁴⁵Elliot, op. cit., p. 117. Elliot does not cite his source and simply gives the quotation.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 112.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones;

Shakespeare.

It was the purpose of this study to examine the life and work of Dr. Thomas Arnold in the context of his times, in order to try and determine what part he played in promoting organised games at Rugby and what were his views on this aspect of school life. Arnold has often been credited, or blamed, for starting the emphasis on games which developed into the athletic cult that figured so prominently in the life of the Public Schools in England in the nineteenth century. It was hoped that an overall examination of Arnold's life would reveal some evidence as to his role with regard to games.

It is apparent that any wide-spread intellectual or social trend must reflect the tenor of the times. The philosophy of any large-scale movement must contain tenets held by many people. The development of the athletic cult, the stress on organised games, and the emphasis on Muscular Christianity were expression of beliefs which were widely held in Victorian England. It was thought that Empire builders needed to acquire group loyalty, team spirit and an unquestioning acquiescence to authority; they were also thought to require physical courage. All these traits, and others, were considered to be fostered by the playing of organised games.

The games and recreational pursuits of a people can be seen as a reflection of the whole society. In a culture where competition is a major element of life, such as in the United States of America today, competition and the urge to win can be seen developed to a high degree. At the extreme, both in life in general and in the sports of the country, it becomes a cult of "win at any cost." In a civilisation in which co-operation is vital to existence, as is the case with small, isolated

groups of people such as the Eskimos of North America, the games and pastimes tend to have a strong element of co-operation in them. Similarly, the actual play patterns of any group reflect, often to the point of mimicry, the basic needs of the community. Thus, in ancient Sparta there was a strong emphasis on training with weapons, developing strength, endurance and speed, and inculcating physical courage and pride in being a Spartan. All of these attributes were thought to be needed if the Spartans were to retain their position as a minority ruling class.

While the recreation of a people reflects life as a whole, the school can be seen as a society in miniature. The educational establishments of a country, by their very nature, have in them most, if not all, of the elements that make up the society. Their business in life is to transmit the culture of the society from the older to the younger generation. It is necessary, for their very existence, that the schools pass on mores and values that the society wishes, and indeed, needs to have inculcated in its children.

If a school to which parents are not compelled to send their children is flourishing, then it is safe to assume that it is serving the needs of at least one section of the community. Study of such a school will reveal much about the culture in which it is situated and, equally, an examination of the society will show, to a large extent the reasons for the school's customs and attitudes. The relationship between a school and the society is one of interaction. Changes in mores and attitudes within the culture will be reflected in the school, but the school, in turn, helps to form the societal ethos. The influence of the

school is limited in a number of ways, by the proportion of the community it serves, by the position within the community held by the past students of the school and factors of this nature. Nevertheless the interaction is, necessarily, present.

The extent of the influence of the society upon the school, and of the school on the society, can be a function of the headmaster, to a certain extent. If the headmaster is the true genius loci then he must exemplify many of the accepted values of the community that supports the school. If he did not, then that support would be withdrawn. On the other hand, if the headmaster is a major figure within the society then his views will receive more attention than if he were not.

The society in which Thomas Arnold lived and worked was that of England in the early nineteenth century, which was in the throes of the transition from a basically rural community, ruled by an hereditary elite, to a predominantly industrial nation, governed by an elected Parliament and paid Civil Servants. The rural, or Barbarian, elements of life were being extirpated as the urban-dwelling middle-classes, the Philistines, acquired more and more power.

The recreational pursuits of the Barbarians were uncircumscribed, with no boundaries other than natural ones, and were ruled by a tradition which went back to medieval times. These sports of hunting, riding, shooting and fishing were a reflection of the Barbarian way of life and the Barbarian ideals. They were free, unrestricted and natural. The Philistines, however, were concerned with law and order, with rules and regulations, with morality and a puritanical

form of religion. Their recreation was a serious business, a preparation for coming work. It lacked the spontaneity and freedom of the older sports. Later in the century it was to be epitomised by lawn tennis, a purely middle-class game with a strong emphasis on rules and narrow, artificial boundaries.

As the industrialists accumulated wealth and power there was a move away from the Barbarian mores to those of the Philistines. This transition was general throughout the country and was reflected in the Public Schools, where law and order, closer supervision and a religious revival became more and more apparent. The recreational activities of the boys also reflected these changes, so that in the boys' pastimes could be seen the effect of changes in the school, which were, in turn, the result of pressures from the changing society.

The changes that took place in the schools were forced upon them by those changes that were taking place in England. Had the schools failed to respond then there is no doubt that they would have ceased to be the major institutions of education for the ruling classes. To continue to hold their place, they had to be prepared to attract the old aristocracy and squirearchy as they had in the past, and yet to persuade the powerful, new middle-classes that the education they offered was also suitable for them. The transition from Barbarian to Philistine dominance in England was rapidly being accomplished, which meant that the schools had to adapt at least as swiftly.

It was at this transitional stage, when the Public Schools had reached the point where they either had to conform to the changing needs of the society or to be superseded, that Arnold was appointed to Rugby.

Throughout Arnold's tenure, Rugby was the epitome of a school in the transition from a Barbarian Public School to a Philistine Public School. The fame of both Arnold and Rugby rests on the fact that it was believed that Arnold had effected that change at Rugby.

The reform of Rugby was seen as evidence that the Public Schools could supply the needs of the new power group as well as those of the older aristocracy. Other schools were organised, or re-organised, on the principles of Arnold's system, and Rugby men were much sought after to carry the headmaster's reforms to these other schools. Some of the Rugby men were spectacularly successful in reforming and building up the establishments to which they moved. Their success further enhanced the reputation of Arnold and of Rugby.

Arnold's reputation as a reformer of the Public Schools did not gain much recognition before his death, but the publicity attendant upon this event, and the subsequent publication of his biography, brought him before the public eye as a God-fearing man who had turned Rugby from a Barbarian wilderness into an institution of Christian gentlemen. In 1857, fifteen years after Arnold's death, Thomas Hughes published Tom Brown's School-days, a novel which extolled the virtues of manliness, of the Christian spirit and of the Philistine games of football and cricket. The book caught the spirit of the age and achieved instant success. From this time on, Arnold's Rugby was thought to have been not only a school for Christian gentlemen, but a haven for muscular Christians. Consequently Arnold, the acknowledged genius loci, was believed to be the man who had first fostered the muscular Christian

ideal. From that time on it has been said, by many different people in many different ways, that to Arnold must go the credit for the development of organised games and therefore of the athletic cult with which it was associated.

The acknowledgement that Arnold's work at Rugby received demonstrates quite clearly that the system he adopted, the changes he made and the reforms he carried out were consonant with the beliefs of many people. It also shows that he was representative of a large segment of the community. At least, this must be true if he were doing what he believed to be right, rather than doing what he thought would meet with general approval, and it is quite certain that Arnold would never have compromised himself by instituting reforms for expediency's sake. Everything he did was accomplished because he believed passionately that it was the right, the moral, the Christian thing to do. Arnold was, quite clearly, a man of his times, and the school that he created was, or, what was just as important, was believed to be, the epitome of a Philistine school, but with enough of the Barbarian elements to appeal to the desire of the middle classes to emulate their social betters.

It is in this retention of the old with the introduction of the new, in the amalgamation of the outward form of the Barbarian institutions with the spirit of Philistinism that Arnold's genius shows. The rising middle classes, although they despised much of the old aristocratic way of life, retained an admiration for some aspects of it. Most of the new elite were industrialists; men who owned goods, not land. They

had acquired wealth, but they lacked, or felt that they lacked, status. They exhibited a strong urge to gain respectability and acceptance. The landed gentry had status and respectability. The industrialists and entrepreneurs had money. In order to acquire the status of the older and well-established classes the new men bought the trappings that were associated with the gentry. They bought land and they even bought titles. They were prepared to buy an education.

The Public Schools had an aristocratic background. The middle classes wanted an education for their sons, and if it were one that would enable them to increase their social standing then it would undoubtedly prove popular. The Public Schools offered a further advantage in that worthwhile connections and friendships could be made there which would be useful in the business world. Even with these advantages the middle classes would not have patronised the Public Schools en masse unless they were reformed. That is to say, unless they became Philistine in spirit.

Arnold managed to retain the Barbarian form of the school, but imbued it with the new spirit. He thus offered to the middle classes an ideal school; one that retained the hallmarks of the aristocracy, and would still attract the landed gentry, but one which complied with the Philistine standards of godliness and good learning. Almost everything that Arnold did at Rugby, every reform he carried out, every change he made, retained the appearance while changing the nature of the institution. The changes invariably reflected the standards and values of the middle classes, as a few examples readily show.

The facet of school life that was most often connected with Arnold was the prefectorial system. The position of prefect, however, had been in existence, in one form or another, for centuries. Hitherto it had been one of privilege, which was entirely in keeping with the privileged position of the class to which the boys belonged. Arnold kept the prefects, but he made their position one of responsibility and duty, which were characteristics much admired by the Philistines. Another major reform that Arnold carried out was to raise the status of assistant masters. Previously the assistant masters, and even the headmasters, were thought of as poorly paid servants who were socially below the boys whom they taught. In keeping with the middle-class search for respectability, Arnold did much to change that. One of the most far-reaching alterations Arnold made was in the boarding-house system. It had long been the custom for boys to board at the major schools, and many of them lived in Dames' houses in the towns. Arnold, by instituting boarding houses that were under the jurisdiction of the school and were run by the assistant masters, reassured prospective parents that their children would be looked after and supervised more carefully. It was an era when paternalistic attitudes were becoming stronger, and Arnold, by moves such as this, was expressing these attitudes in the school. Doubtless the most important adaptation he made, as far as winning the approval of the middle classes is concerned, was the use of the Chapel and the increased stress he placed on religion. Again he kept the institution, but changed the spirit. An examination of Arnold's career at Rugby shows this

policy to have been one he applied consistently.

The result of this general policy was to create an ethos in the school which was compatible with that of the country in general. The school and the headmaster were reacting to the societal pressures of the day. The school reflected the changing mores, morals and values of the day, and, to some extent, doubtless helped to create that change.

While the school was epitomising the changing values incurred in the transfer of power from the aristocracy to the middle-classes, the games and physical activities of the boys reflected the changes that were taking place in the school. The old, rural, Barbarian pursuits were being replaced by games which were in keeping with the Philistine values that were gaining ascendance. As Arnold attempted to curb the hunting, the poaching and the other activities to which the boys had been accustomed, there was a corresponding increase in the time given to pastimes that were acceptable both to the school authorities and to society as a whole. Football and cricket had been popular long before Arnold's time, but had shared their popularity with the Barbarian pursuits. As the weight of authority and of public opinion came down on the lawless activities the boys were forced into playing those games, like football and cricket, which received official sanction, if not actual encouragement.

At the beginning of Arnold's tenure there was little difference, in some respects, between the games, particularly football, and the other activities in which the boys participated. Football was, as it had

been for centuries, a mass battle in which crowds of boys fought each other and the ball was almost incidental. It was a wild, lawless exhibition of strength in which rules were few. This was completely out of touch with the ethos that was being created as a need for rules, regulations and greater efficiency became more apparent, and more a part of life.

The move towards law and order, towards rules and regulations and towards efficiency can be seen in many aspects of life at the time, but is best exemplified in the factories. At this period the advantages of a factory system, as opposed to workers producing goods in their own cottages, were being more and more exploited. Once there is an assembly line of any sort, then there has to be rules. If there is not conformity of action then the system breaks down. It is impossible for a man to leave his place on the line unless there is an immediate replacement. Some form of team spirit, of group cohesion is necessary for the smooth running of the plant, which means that the workers must all abide by the same rules. These conditions, so typical of the new age, were in direct contrast to those which had obtained previously when the cottagers and craftsmen plied their trade.

There was, then, a growing conviction of the need for rules and regulations; this conviction was reflected in the school-life at Rugby, which became ever more closely regulated, and was given practical expression in the games. Associated with this greater acceptance of rules was an increased awareness of boundaries. By this time the Enclosure Acts were a fait accompli. A man might dispute the squire's

right to fence off land and keep the wild-life for his own use, but he had to accept it.

Another aspect of life at that time which affected men's thinking was the need for supervision. On a farm, a man is told to do a job; rarely does he need constant watching while he does it. In a factory the situation is different. A foreman is needed to keep the work flow even, to check the quality of the goods coming off the line and to ensure that the employer is getting his money's worth of work. In any case the middle classes had never held to the aristocratic ideal of freedom. The middle class patriarch liked to know where his family was, he made rules to ensure that the members of the family were where they were supposed to be, and took the measures necessary to enforce those rules. Arnold's method of looking after his children at Fox How, with written rules, and close supervision, is typical of this kind of care. The aristocracy had been much more inclined to leave children to their own devices or had hired someone to look after them.

All of these developments helped to establish a frame of mind in which organised games would be acceptable. Restrictions, boundaries, supervision, rules and regulations, even concepts of group cohesion, all combined to make the acceptance of organised games more likely and the rejection of the Barbarian pursuits more certain. It also meant that Arnold's attempts to stop these latter activities were more likely to meet with success, to receive the support of the parents and possibly even some of the boys.

The move towards conformity, uniformity and obedience to rules can be seen in the developments that took place within the games the boys played. In the beginning these games were almost completely unorganised. The few rules that did exist were unwritten but were quickly learned by all who played. An excellent example of unwritten rules being passed on is given by Hughes in Tom Brown's School-days. Tom Brown is having a fight and throws his opponent with a wrestling hold. The boys then divide into two camps on the legality of the throw. One group insists that Tom is within his rights to throw his man, while the other says that it should be fists only. As the dispute rages a Sixth Form boy comes out and is asked for the ruling. Immediately he answers that Brown may throw his man providing he catches him fairly above the waist. This was the way with all the sports of the school, at the beginning of Arnold's tenure.

Gradually, however, there came a change. First the Sixth Formers held levees in which they decided upon rule changes, without putting them into writing. Later still the rules were written down. A further, major change was the reduction of players. It was in the late thirties that a team of about fifteen or twenty of the best players was first selected, instead of every body that could be pressed into service being included.

The fact that these changes took place during, or shortly after, Arnold's tenure does not necessarily imply that he was directly concerned. It does show that the times were right for such changes to occur and does indicate the possibility that Arnold's sympathy

towards rules and organisation, together with his work in other aspects of school life, was helping these changes to take place.

There was at this time a general move towards law and order. The Metropolitan Police Act, which gave London its first policemen, was passed in 1828, the year in which Arnold went to Rugby. The fear of lawlessness, of mob-rule, which had grown out of the French Revolution, produced, or helped to produce, a climate of opinion in which government and supervision were looked upon as benefits, rather than as infringements of rights, as they might have been in the previous century. Thus, when the boys introduced written rules for games they were reacting to a general change in attitude, as well as to the specific needs within the school. At Rugby the first written rules for football were set down in 1845, three years after Arnold's death, and, in part, it was the civilising influence that he had brought to the school which had created the need for rules.

The civilising influence of Arnold is seen in a number of ways. He had a paternalistic approach to schoolmastering which was well-received because it fitted in with the way in which people were beginning to think. The idea of locking over a hundred children into one room for ten to twelve hours with no supervision, or of boys roaming the countryside with no more control over them than that they had to be back at school by a stated time, was no longer acceptable to many parents. In schools such as Marlborough, where there was no tradition of games, the authorities were impelled to promote them as a suitable alternative to such activities. At Rugby, however, the

outlawing of activities which could not be easily supervised served to encourage the boys to take part in the already established and accepted pastimes of football and cricket. To Arnold this was a suitable and satisfactory alternative.

Apart from creating an ethos in which games might develop, Arnold also introduced a number of changes that helped, more directly, to foster the boys' interest in games. One of the most important was his reliance upon and the authority that he gave to the Sixth Form. Fagging was a well-established aspect of life in all the Public Schools, but Arnold's legalisation of it made it easier for the older boys to force the younger into helping them practise football, cricket or fives. His insistence upon self-government among the pupils was most easily put into effect on the sports field. This domain was, by tradition, solely the boys', and Arnold's attempts to make the seniors responsible members of the community are reflected in the way in which mob-rule of the biggest and strongest was gradually replaced by the Sixth Form levees in which changes in rules were discussed and passed by vote. The same kind of civilising is seen in the Debating Society which was started in Arnold's time. Previously everyone had stood, and the tallest boy with the loudest voice had been the chief speaker, but after the Debating Society was inaugurated the boys learned to sit and to listen and to speak in turn. Changes such as this are not only indicative of a difference in attitude, but also helped to create that difference.

The effect of the boarding houses on the development of games is one that it is difficult to overestimate. Late in the century when the

games' hero won his colours and was able to parade in his special cap, or blazer, or scarf, or sweater, the honour was not just because of his athletic prowess, but was also because he had brought glory to the house and to the school. His feats were, in a sense, a community service. The idea was that the boy did not perform well for himself, but for the team. The team did not expend every effort in its own behalf only, but for the House and then for the School. Arnold started this trend, although he would never have allowed it to develop as it did had he been alive to see the consequences of his actions. It was not simply that he developed the boarding-house system that makes him a progenitor of this aspect of the games syndrome, but the stress he placed on community service, both among the boys and among the masters. He wanted men about him who had a feeling for the community, who acknowledged a responsibility to the community, to the old, the sick and the poor. Also important was his own personality, and the attacks that were made on him from outside the school. Those who knew him well developed an esprit de corps that was centered around Arnold. The Rugby men at the two universities formed separate groups; they felt themselves to be different. They were called prigs by others; they were thought to be old before their time, but they were distinct; they were Rugby men, men who had known Arnold. There was a pride in belonging to Rugby; there was a pride in belonging to a House, especially to School House. The beginnings of the fierce loyalty to House and School that was such a feature of the Public Schools by the 1880's was already apparent at Rugby in the 1830's, and it was there

because Arnold had created Houses and because Arnold had inspired such intense loyalty among his Sixth Form boys and his assistant masters.

There is ample evidence of the pride that the boys had in their own houses and the desire to be "Cock-House" was very strong. This partisan feeling is depicted very clearly in Tom Brown's School-days and shows up in personal letters of the boys of the time, in memoirs and other writings. It would seem that there was a progression from games in which the school as a whole participated, to matches between segments of the school population, (increasingly the segments would be Houses) and then to organised games. These last were held, particularly, among the individual Houses in order to prepare teams for the inter-House matches. Then the progression was to organised games for all boys in the Houses, including the weaklings, which eventually led to the tyranny of games which existed by the end of the century. Arnold saw the beginnings of this movement as the Houses became stronger and the boys' loyalty to them greater, and there is no doubt that he actively encouraged this stage of its growth by his belief in the boarding-house as an integral part of a Public School and the role of the senior boys in running the internal life of the school.

Arnold's emphasis on the role of the Sixth Form in the school had a dual basis. In the first place he saw the Sixth Form as the major civilising and disciplining agency, but in the second, he believed that by giving these young men so much responsibility he would greatly assist

their personal development, and hasten their growth to maturity. The power and authority he gave his praeposters was great and could be exercised on the games field better than anywhere else, if only because the games were traditionally regulated by the boys. However, this was also the one area where the physically mature and skillful boys were most likely to gain an influence over the younger boys.

Arnold cannot have failed to realise the possibility of this kind of boy whom he would not have considered the most suitable, achieving such influence. His belief that virtue was not innocence, but the result of facing trials and overcoming them, was sufficient for him to decide that the potential good of games was greater than the potential evil. This is the only view of the matter which fits both the fact that games continued to flourish and that Arnold inevitably reformed anything he considered evil. If he had not thought that more good would come from games than evil he would have reformed them or abolished them.

The views Arnold expressed on the dangers of boys being objects of hero worship because of their physical prowess are too clearly stated for there to be any idea that he would have countenanced the state into which games later developed. Neither Arnold, nor other headmasters with similar ideas, could have foreseen the results of the growing emphasis on games and physical prowess. Arnold, and men like Temple, Tait, Benson and Christopher Wordsworth, for example, were concerned with producing Christian gentlemen and the changes they made in their schools were directed towards that end. They cannot be blamed for not foreseeing that these changes might lead to their ideals

being altered beyond recognition. They were advocating a revival of Christian religion, and worked towards that end; they cannot be impugned for the fact that the revival turned into a form of muscular Christianity.

It has been said that Arnold's life and work was not based on religion, but was religious; every action, every thought, every idea, every belief, all had a religious connotation. God's work could be accomplished in many ways, not only by praying, preaching and good works, important as those things were, but also by the way in which one lived and behaved towards one's fellows in every possible situation. Thus the chapel was an integral part of school life, but the business of a school was to be conducted in the same spirit as that in which one went to chapel, or even visited a boy who was dying. With this kind of belief, any part of school life, including games, provided that they were played in the right spirit, could be seen as helping to create a Christian gentleman.

Arnold was inculcating middle-class virtues in his scholars, and games, as they developed in the second half of the century, were undoubtedly a middle-class phenomenon. Thus it can be said that he was preparing the way for the later developments that took place in games. It has been shown that a number of the improvements that he made at Rugby aided the movement towards the acceptance of Philistine standards. In the moral sphere, the trust he placed in the boys, to the extent that he always believed what they told him until they were proven to be untruthful, the implicit faith he had in his Sixth Form, and the

Christian way of life that he promoted at Rugby, all combined to foster middle-class virtues. Even his attempts to reduce physical punishment were symptomatic of the civilising process and the move towards Philistinism as opposed to Barbarianism. Arnold was not alone in his attempts to bring about this change, but he was possessed of a dynamic personality and a forceful character which enabled him to overcome obstacles that a man like Christopher Wordsworth, who had much the same ideals, found to be too great.

Arnold's personality is a major factor in any consideration of his work and his influence. He was not a man to whom people felt attracted at first sight. From the time he was a very young child, strangers had found him difficult to talk to; his pupils at Rugby found him stern and forbidding while they were in the lower school and if they left before reaching the Sixth, as many did, he must have remained a remote, rather frightening figure. He was not at his best with strangers right up to the end of his life; his failure to convince the other members of the Senate of the London University was probably due as much to the fact that he did not know them intimately as that his arguments were not strong enough. In the school, among the staff and with his Sixth Form Arnold was much more relaxed, much more human, much more like the kind and playful father that his family knew. His influence on these close companions was immense, to the extent that some of them even adopted his mannerisms as well as his beliefs. This effect he had on people must be borne in mind when considering his views on physical activity. The example he gave of a man who was determined to have his daily exercise, and that of as strenuous a nature as possible, must have

impressed those around him. Similarly the fact that he played, and enjoyed, games of cricket with his own sons, must have been known to the boys in the school, since, at one time, four of his sons were pupils at Rugby. The fact that Arnold would stop to watch a game of football had a greater effect upon the boys than that of a lesser man joining them on the field. Arnold sanctioned games, and to the boys and men who were at school with him and who knew his vehement hatred of anything he considered evil, this must have put games into a special category: those activities of which Arnold approved.

Arnold's reasons for approving of games were probably complex, but it seems likely that his religious beliefs, coupled with his admiration of the Greeks, were a major factor. He once said, "I believe that all my opinions religious and political may be traced to the Scriptures and Aristotle together;--... ." ¹ He adopted the Greek belief in the need for arete, or all-round excellence, for kalos kagothos, the ideal of balance between bodily and spiritual, physical and moral qualities, and sophrosyne, the ideal of self-restraint discipline and moderation from which came the concept of eudaemonism, the ethical-moral code which regards the aim of human conduct to be the attainment of the total sum of all pleasures, both sensual and non-sensual. In his own physical recreations, his love of the Greeks showed in the way in which, even as a boy, he loved to re-enact the classical battles, and in his life-long fondness for spearing. In a less obvious way, the influence of the Greeks showed in his delight in physical activity and his belief in the need for strenuous daily exercise.

G. G. Coulton, a contemporary and friend of some of Arnold's pupils, particularly C. J. Vaughan, comments:

In modern life, there is perhaps no nearer parallel, on a large scale, to the relations of Socrates with his pupils. Those who went up to the University from the Rugby of Arnold and Temple had something more nearly approaching to the full breadth and depth of Greek culture than any equally numerous body in Great Britain, or perhaps even on the Continent, since the days of ancient Greece.²

Football and cricket contributed their share of this eudaemonistic concept.

However, Arnold's Greek ideals were tempered with a strong belief in the Protestant Christian faith, with its emphasis on work. Arnold had to justify his play to himself as being a time of regeneration, or recuperation, a time to prepare for the more important work ahead. He was, in fact, a classic example of the Protestant Work Ethic in practice. This rather strange combination of beliefs may well have enabled him to look upon games with a benevolent eye. When he saw the complete absorption of the boys as they battled on the football field, he must have thought that this was an ideal form of relaxation as well as of strenuous exercise, so that it fulfilled his criteria of keeping the body fit and preparing the mind for work to come.

A feature of life in ancient Greece, which was clearly apparent in Victorian England, and which Arnold certainly approved and encouraged, although not in relation to games, was the spirit of competition. He laid stress on examinations, gave prizes for good work, encouraged boys who were not of the highest calibre but who worked to the best of their abilities and, in general, made competition an integral part of the Rugby system. In this he was again reflecting the age in which he lived.

Industrialization and the laissez-faire doctrine led inexorably to intense competition. The influence of the Protestant Work Ethic and of Calvin's belief in the Elect gave added stimulus to the competitive spirit. It is only natural that when an attitude becomes as all-pervasive as competitiveness did in England during the nineteenth century that it will make its appearance in all aspects of life. Certainly the sports of the people and of the schoolboys became much more seriously competitive as the century progressed. It may well be that men who looked to Arnold's work for guidance noted his use of the competitive element in the school life and applied it to the playing field.

Certainly a number of the Arnoldians thought that football had worthwhile qualities, for they took "Big Side" football with them to many other schools and in some cases promoted it and cricket vigorously. While it is possible that these men saw advantages in organised games that Arnold did not, the pros and cons of games must have been a subject for discussion at Rugby, if not at the staff meetings, then at the informal gatherings. The staff was comprised of men who had been through the Public School system, several of them at Rugby, so they had personal experience of games. Doubtless their attitudes towards them were coloured by their own prowess, but nevertheless, even Cotton and Vaughan, neither of whom had enjoyed games nor been at all skillful at them, promoted football and cricket in their schools, and Cotton took the Rugby form of football to Marlborough with him.

If Vaughan did not promote games as vigorously as Cotton it can still be said that cricket, under the care of Ponsonby and Grimston, was, apparently, being played for its character-building properties at

Harrow while Vaughan was headmaster, and that he must have been aware of their philosophy and condoned it, even if he did not actively advocate it. In any case, games flourished at Harrow during Vaughan's tenure, and must have had his approval. At Marlborough games also flourished and were strenuously promoted by Cotton.

While it is not possible to say that Vaughan and Cotton were Arnoldians and therefore promoted organised games, it is possible to say that they were Arnoldians and promoted organised games. It is possible to make the same two statements about a number of other Arnoldians, which indicates that there may have been a common source for both facts. There are, however, not enough men who can be shown to have been Arnoldians and to have promoted organised games for any valid suggestion to be made that Arnold was the common source for their belief in organised games.

Any argument that might be made along those lines is seriously weakened by the fact that there are men whose work shows them to have been Arnoldians but for whom there is no evidence that they were at all interested in promoting games. There are other men who were at Rugby with Arnold and then went on to teaching positions in other schools who have left no evidence that they could be classed as Arnoldians, nor have they left any evidence as to their attitudes towards games. Such a lack of information does not constitute an argument against their being men who spread Arnold's ideas and beliefs, or against their promoting games, but it does weaken any claim for Arnold being the progenitor of the athletic cult.

Even for those cases where a direct line can be drawn from the Rugby men to Arnold, showing them to have been Arnoldians, and where it can be seen that they promoted games, there is no reason to believe that it was from Arnold that this idea came. There were too many influences outside Rugby and Arnold that might have moved the men in this direction for Arnold to be accepted as the cause. It must be remembered that, by the nature of things, most of the Rugby men were Arnold's successors, chronologically, rather than his contemporaries, so that they must have been more strongly influenced than Arnold by the societal pressures which were helping to make games so popular. The mere fact that athleticism was growing was, in itself, a factor in forcing masters into encouraging games. Such a situation invariably has a snowball effect, in that the more the schools adopted a positive attitude towards games, the greater became the pressure, and so on until such time as a reaction set in.

In all, it must be said that an examination of the work of the men who had been assistant masters or pupils at Rugby, with Arnold, does not show a clear pattern of Arnold's influence and their attitudes towards organised games. It does seem probable that some of these men realized, while they were at Rugby, that games could be used as a disciplinary tool, but there is no evidence to show that Arnold reached the same conclusion or that they were following his lead. It is interesting, however, that many of them did take Rugby's football with them.

The introduction into various schools of Big Side football by the Rugby men undoubtedly led to its adoption in other schools. This was

partly because Arnold's reputation made many people eager to incorporate Arnold's system into their own schools, and football must have seemed to be part of the system, even if, in fact, it were not, and partly because of the increased desire to play inter-school matches. The development of the railways meant that travel between schools was quick, cheap and practical, but a certain uniformity of rules was essential if games were to be equally practical. At first the tendency was to play according to the rules of the home team, but gradually the schools adopted a reasonably uniform set of rules.

Arnold's reputation, which was already growing before his death, was given a tremendous boost by the publication of Stanley's Life, and later by Tom Brown's School-days, which not only introduced Arnold to a much wider public, but also encouraged the belief that Arnold was an advocate of games. The spread of the Rugby game of football had linked it with Arnold before Hughes published his novel, and the book served as a confirmation of that link. By this time, games had begun to assume some of the proportions that made them so large a part of Public School life. Edward Thring had been headmaster of Uppingham for four years in 1857 when Hughes' book was published, and he had opened his tenure by declaring a whole holiday and then playing cricket with the boys, scoring a useful 15 runs in the process. The public was ready to accept the athletic cult, and Arnold's reputation as the reformer of the Public Schools was so great that it was easy for him to be credited with this innovation also, especially when Tom Brown showed that Arnold had approved of games. Thus it is that in 1970 a writer can say:

More important than the Universities, whom they fed, was the rise of public school cricket. Of course there was nothing new in such cricket: what was new was the increasing number of such schools, newly founded, or newly reorganized or re-endowed, all imitations of Dr. Arnold's Rugby, all preaching mens sana in corpore sano and all playing cricket hard.³

Arnold was firmly established as progenitor of the athletic cult in the late 1850's, a position he has retained to today, but the grounds for this reputation would appear to be Arnold's position as the accepted reformer of the Public Schools and the fact that he epitomised so much that was typical of his era and, more particularly, of the one which followed. There is always a tendency to look to major figures as the source of inspiration and Arnold, accepted as the virtual re-founder of the Public Schools, provided an obvious source for the athletic cult which was such an integral part of those schools by the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The writers who claim Arnold as the person to whom the athletic cult should be credited may well be right, but not in the way that such a statement would normally imply. The lack of evidence makes it possible to say that Arnold did not actively promote games in the way that was done later in the nineteenth century. It is certain that he never used, nor would have considered using, games to promote the kind of character traits that were later thought to be the end product of games-playing. Nevertheless, Arnold did create an ethos in his school that was conducive to the growth of games. He channelled the boys into organised games by stopping their other activities, and he approved of games. This last fact is of greater significance than

appears at first sight. The approval of a man like Arnold was enough to cause other men to accept the object of his approval as something very worthwhile. This was true of those who worked with him; men who were so much under Arnold's influence that they acquired his very mannerisms. These men took football with them when they left Rugby in the same way that they took the prefect system and the classical curriculum. Arnold's approval also led men who did not know him personally to adopt games with the rest of what they took to be his system. His reputation became such that his approval was recommendation enough. The fact that his biographer could say that in his later years his pupils "...observed with pleasure the unaffected interest with which, ... he would stand in the school-field and watch the issue of their favourite games of football,"⁴ was sufficient for games to be promoted in his name.

It was, then, Arnold's work in turning Rugby from a Barbarian to a Philistine school which set the scene for the development of organised games and the athletic cult. The whole movement, however, was caused by societal pressures which were outside the scope of any one man to create or control.

NOTES

¹Letter from Thomas Arnold to A. P. Stanley, dated Fox How, July 28, 1837. Rugby MS.

²G. G. Coulton, A Victorian Schoolmaster: Henry Hart of Sedbergh (London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd., 1923), p. 46.

³Rowland Bowam, Cricket: A History of Its Growth and Development Throughout the World (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1970), p. 115.

⁴A. P. Stanley, The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D. (London: B. Fellowes, 1844), p. 178.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study did not attempt to analyse the development of the athletic cult in the Public Schools of the nineteenth century, but it is felt that this is a fruitful area of research for the sports historian and that by studying this phenomenon it would be possible to cast further light on the part played by Rugby and by Arnold. It is suggested that one method of examining the problem would be to compare and contrast the development of organised games and the growth of the athletic cult in schools which followed the Rugby pattern with those which did not. In this way the dual purpose of examining the trend towards athleticism and examining Arnold's role in that trend could be accomplished. It is apparent that a carefully selected sample of schools from both categories could provide much useful data on this aspect of the development of middle-class sports.

A further area that is shown by the present study to require investigation is the development of the organisation of certain sports, particularly football and cricket. It is suggested that knowledge of the men who were involved in spreading these games, in codifying the rules and developing the governing bodies, would help to establish the source of their enthusiasm, and would cast more light on the origins of the athletic cult.

The growth and development of organised games in the English Public Schools of the nineteenth century have had such far-reaching

effects on the sports-patterns of the western world that a thorough understanding of this development is basic to an understanding of the current situation. It is believed that many studies on various aspects of the games of the Public Schools should be instituted, especially studies which will aid in an understanding of why the games developed as they did, and why they became so important in the lives not only of Public School boys, but of the whole nation and eventually of the western world.

It is hoped that the present study will serve to stimulate further work in this area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackermann, R. The History of the Colleges of Winchester, Eton, and Wesminster, with the Charter-House, The Schools of St. Paul's Merchant Taylors, Harrow and Rugby, and the Free School of Christ's Hospital, London. 1816
- Adamson, John W. Education: 1789-1902. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- A Short History of Education Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1919.
- Altham, H.S. A History of Cricket. London; Allen and Unwin, 1926.
- An Old Cheltonian. Reminiscences of Cheltenham College. London: Bemrose & Sons. 1868.
- An Old Harrovian. Harrow Recollections. London: Routledge, 1867.
- An Old Rugbeian. Recollections of Rugby. London: Hamilton and Adams, 1848.
- Arbuthnot, Lady Constance, ed. Sir A.G. Arbuthnot: Memories of Rugby and India. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1910.
- Archer, R.L. Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge: The University Press, 1921.
- Arnold, Matthew. Culture and Anarchy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Arnold, Thomas. Effects of Distant Colonisation on the Parent State. Privately printed. Oxford, 1815.
- History of Rome. Vols. I, II, III. London: B. Fellowes Last Volume 1843.
- Introductory Lectures on Modern History delivered in Lent Term, MDCCCLXII with the Inaugural Lecture delivered in December MDCCCXLI. London: Longmans Green and Co., 1885.
- Principles of Church Reform: with an introductory essay by M.J. Jackson and J. Rogan. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1962.
- Miscellaneous Works. London: B. Fellowes, 1845.
- Sermons, Christian Life. London: B. Fellowes, 1829.
- Sermons. Christian Life and Doctrine. London: B. Fellowes, 1834.

- Sermons. Christian Life, its Hopes, its Fears and its Close.
London: B. Fellowes, 1842.
- Sermons. Christian Life at School. London: B. Fellowes,
1832.
- Sermons. Christian Life, its Course, its Hindrances and
its Helps. London: B. Fellowes, 1841.
- Sermons. Essay on the Right Interpretation and Understanding
of the Scriptures. London: B. Fellowes, 1845.
- Thucydides. Oxford: J. Parker, 1830-5.
- Arnold, Thomas. Passages in a Wandering Life. London: Edward Arnold,
1900.
- New Zealand Letters. Auckland: University of Auckland, 1966.
- Ashcroft, R.L. Haileybury 1908-1961. Haileybury: The Haileybury Society,
1961.
- Author of 'Etonia'. The Public Schools: Winchester, Westminster, Shrewsbury,
Harrow, Rugby: Notes of their History and Traditions. Edinburgh
and London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. 1867.
- Badger, A.B. The Public Schools and the Nation. London: Robert Hale
Ltd., 1944.
- Bamford, T.W. Rise of the Public Schools. London: Thomas Nelson &
Sons Ltd., 1967.
- Thomas Arnold. London: Cresset Press, 1960.
- ed. Thomas Arnold on Education. Cambridge: University Press,
1970.
- Barnard, H.C. A Short History of English Education from 1760-1944.
London: University Press, 1949.
- Benson, E.F. David Blaize. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1916.
- Bertram, James, ed. New Zealand Letters of Thomas Arnold the Younger
with Further Letters from Van Dieman's Land and Letters of
Arthur Hugh Clough 1847-1851. London and Wellington: Oxford
University Press, 1966.
- Bettinson, G.H. Rugby School. Birmingham: Harold Saunders Ltd., 1929.
- Bloxam, Matthew Holbeche. Rugby, The School and the Neighbourhood.
London: Whittaker & Co., 1889.

- Book of Rugby School. Its History and Daily Life. Rugby: Crossley & Billington, 1856.
- Bowen, Rowland. Cricket: A History of its growth and development. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1970.
- Bradby, H.C. Rugby. London: George Bell & Sons, 1900.
- Bradley, G.G. Recollections of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. London: John Murray, 1883.
- Bradley, A.G. Champneys, A.C.; and Barnes, J.W.; A History of Marlborough College during Fifty Years from its Foundation to the Present Time. London: John Murray, 1893.
- Bradley, A.G. Champneys, A.C.; and Barnes, J.W.; Revised and Continued by Taylor, J.R.; Brentnall, H.C.; and Turner G.C.; A History of Marlborough College. London: John Murray, 1923.
- Briggs, Asa. Victorian People. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1967.
- Brown, A.T. Some Account of the Royal Institution School, Liverpool. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1924.
- Brown, Horatio F. John Adlington Symonds: A Biography. 2 vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 1895.
- Bryant, Philly Henry Morgan. Harrow. London: Blackie & Son Ltd., 1936.
- Campbell, Rev. Reginald J. Thomas Arnold. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1927.
- Cantor, N.F. and Wertham, M.S. eds. The English Tradition: Vol. II Since 1714. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967.
- Carlisle, Nicholas. A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England & Wales; Ornamented with Engravings. London: Baldwin, Cradock & Joy, 1818.
- Carpenter, Lant. Brief Notes on the Rev. Dr. Arnold's Principles of Church Reform. Rowland Hunter, 1833.
- Clough, Arthur Hugh. Letters and Remains of Arthur Hugh Clough. London: Spottiswoode and Co., 1865.
- Collins, William Lucas. The Public Schools. London: Blackwood, 1867.
- Commemoration of the Tercentenary of Harrow School. Harrow: Crossley & Clarke, 1871.
- Cookson, C., ed. Essays on Secondary Education. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.

- Cooper, Leonard. The Age of Wellington. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1964.
- Cotton, Mrs. Sophia A., ed. Memoirs of George Lynch Cotton, D.D. Bishop of Calcutta & Metropolitan with Selections from his Journals and Correspondence. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1872.
- Cotton, George E.L. Sermons and Addresses delivered in the Chapel of Marlborough College 1852-8. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1858.
- The Antiquities of Marlborough College. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1855.
- Craze, Michael R. History of Felsted School, 1564-1947. Ipswich: Cowell, 1955.
- Daryl, Sydney. School Days at Harrow. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1867.
- Davidson, Randall T. and Benham, William. Life of Archbishop Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury. 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1891.
- Deane, A.C., et al. Pillars of the English Church. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1934.
- Elliott, R.W. The Story of King Edward VI School Bury St. Edmunds. Published by the Foundation Governors of the School. Bury St. Edmunds, 1963.
- Elliott-Binns, L.E. Religion in the Victorian Era. London: The Lutterworth Press, 1936.
- Few Words on the Monitorial System at Harrow. London: 1854.
- Findlay, J.J. Arnold of Rugby. Cambridge: University Press, 1914.
- Firth, J.D'E.E. Winchester College. Winchester: P. & G. Wells Ltd., 1949.
- Fisher, G.W. Annals of Shrewsbury School. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1899.
- Fitch, Sir Joshua. Thomas and Matthew Arnold and their Influence on English Education. New York: Charles Scribener & Sons, 1899.
- Football Records of Rugby School, 1823-1929. Rugby: George Over, 1930.
- Fox, Archibald D. Public School Life: Harrow. London: Sir I. Pitman & Sons Ltd., 1911.

- Follow Up: The Story of a Commonplace Harrovian. London: Brown, Langham & Co., Ltd., 1908.
- Goodwin, M. ed. Nineteenth Century Opinion. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1951.
- Goulburn, Edward M. ed. The Book of Rugby School - Its History and Daily Life. Rugby: Crossley and Billington, 1856.
- Gourlay, A.B. A History of Sherborne School. Dorset: Sawtells of Sherborne Ltd., 1971.
- Graham, E. The Harrow Life of Henry Montague Butler. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920.
- Green, G. The Official History of the F.A. Cup. London: Heinemann, 1960.
- Grosskurth, Phyllis. John Addington Symonds, a biography. London: Longmans, 1964.
- Halevy, E. A History of the English People. 1905-15. London: T.F. Unwin Ltd. 1934.
- Handford, B.W.T. Lancing 1848-1930. Oxford: Blackwell, 1933.
- Harrow Calendar: The School lists from January, 1845 to September 1859 with a History of Harrow School etc.
- Harrow: One of Our Great Public Schools. Harrow: Crossley and Clarke, 1867.
- Hedley, G.W. and Murray, G.W. Physical Education for Boys. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1936.
- Hope-Simpson, J.B. Rugby Since Arnold. London: Macmillan Co. Ltd., 1967.
- Houghton, W.E. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- How, F.D. Six Great Schoolmasters: Hawtrey, Mokerly, Kennedy, Vaughan, Temple, Bradley. London: Methuen & Co., 1905.
- Howson, Edmund Whytehead and Warner, George Townsend, eds. Harrow School. London: E. Arnold, 1898.
- Hughes, Thomas. Memoir of a Brother. Boston: J.R. Osgood, 1873.
- Tom Brown's School-days. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.
- Icely, H.E.M. Brownsgrave School Through Four Centuries. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953.

- Jackman, Sydney W. ed. The English Reform Tradition. 1790-1910. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Jackson, M.J. and Rogan, J. eds. Principles of Church Reform: Thomas Arnold. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1962.
- Kirk, K.E. The Story of the Woodard Schools. Abingdon-on-Thames: The Abbey Press, 1952.
- Laborde, E.D. Harrow School Yesterday and Today. London: Winchester Publications Ltd., 1948.
- Lake, K. ed. Memorials of William Charles Lake. London: Edward Arnold, 1901.
- Leach, A.F. History of Warwick School. London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1906.
- Lockwood, Edward. The Early Days of Marlborough College. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co. Ltd., 1893.
- Lunn, Arnold. The Harrovians. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1913.
- Lyttleton, Hon. R.H.; Page, Arthur; and Noel, Evan B. eds. Fifty Years of Sport at Oxford, Cambridge and the Great Public Schools, Eton, Harrow and Winchester. London: Walter Southwood & Co. Ltd., 1922.
- McIntosh, Peter C. Landmarks in the History of Physical Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Physical Education in England since 1800. London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 1968.
- Sport in Society. London: C.A. Watts & Co. Ltd., 1968.
- Mack, E.C. Public Schools and British Opinion, 1780-1860. London: Methuen, 1938.
- Mack, E.C. and Armytage, W.H.G. Thomas Hughes: The Life of the Author of 'Tom Brown's School-days'. London: Methuen, 1938.
- Marlborough by the Boys. London: (Kenneth Mason), Jenkins, 1963.
- Minchin, J.G. Cotton. Old Harrow Days. London: Methuen and Co., 1898.
- Our Public Schools: Their Influence on English History. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. Ltd., 1901.
- Mitchell, Rev. A.T. The Rugby Register, 1675-1842. Rugby: A.J. Lawrence, 1902.
- Monro, F.R.D'O. Repton Cricket 1901-1951. Rugby: George Over Ltd., 1953.

- Moraze, Charles. The Triumph of the Middle Classes. London: Weidensfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
- Morgan, M.C. Cheltenham College: The First Hundred Years. Chalfont St. Giles: Richard Sadler Ltd., 1968.
- Mozley, James B. Essays Historical and Theological. 2 vols. London: Rivingtons, 1878.
- Newmarch, Rev. Charles. Recollections of Rugby. London: Hamilton and Adams, 1848.
- Newsome, David. Godliness and Good Learning. London: John Murray, 1961.
- The Parting of Friends - A Study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning. London: John Murray, 1966.
- Nicolas, Nicholas Harris. The History of the Town and School of Rugby. Northampton: E. Pretty, 1826.
- Norwood, C. The English Tradition of Education. London: John Murray, 1929.
- Norwood, C. and Hope, A.H. The Higher Education of Boys in England. London: John Murray, 1909.
- Ogilvie, V. The English Public School. London: B.T. Batsford, Ltd., 1957.
- Oldham, J.B. A History of Shrewsbury School 1552 - 1952. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Page, W. ed. The Victoria History of the County of Warwick. Vol. II. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Prothero, Rowland E. The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, late Dean of Westminster. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1894.
- Prothero, Rowland E. and Bradley, G.G. The Life and Correspondence of A.P. Stanley. London: John Murray, 1893.
- Reed, J.R. The Old School Ties: The Public Schools in British Literature. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1964.
- Report of the Sub-committee of the Old Rugbeians Society. The Origins of Rugby Football. Rugby: A.J. Lawrence, 1897.
- Rodgers, J. The Old Public Schools of England. London: Batsford Ltd., 1938.

- Rouse, W.H.D. A History of Rugby School. London: Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1909.
- Rugby School Cricket Scores, Foreign and Bigside Matches, 1831-1893.
Rugby: A.J. Lawrence, 1894.
- Rugby School: Its Origin and Influence. 1925.
- Sanders, C.R. Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement: studies in Coleridge, Arnold, Hare, Carlyle and Maurice. Durham N.C: Duke University Press, 1942.
- School Foundations and Class Education, etc. London: Rivingtons 1865.
- Scott, Edward John Long. Records of the Grammar School founded by John Lyon at Harrow-on-the-Hill. A.D. 1572. Harrow: J.C. Wilkee, 1886.
- Selfe, Rose E. Dr. Arnold of Rugby. London: Cassell and Co. Ltd., 1889.
- Simon, Brian. Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1964.
- Skirving, E. Scot, ed. Cheltenham College Register, 1841-1927. Cheltenham: The College, 1928.
- Stanley, A.P. ed. Arnold's Travelling Journals, with extracts from the Life and Letters. London: B. Fellowes, 1852.
- Stanley, A.P. The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D. 2 vols. London: B. Fellowes, 1844.
- Stephen, Leslie and Lee, Sydney, eds. Dictionary of National Biography. London: Smith, Elder and Co. Ltd., 1908.
- Strachey, Lytton. Eminent Victorians. New York: The Modern Library, 1918.
- Straight, Sir Douglas. School Days at Harrow. London: Routledge, 1867.
- Symonds, Margaret. Out of the Past. London: John Murray, 1925.
- Tercentenary of Rugby School. Rugby: W.I. Tait and Sons, 1867.
- Thomas, Bernard, ed. Repton 1557-1957. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1957.
- Thomas, Hugh. The Establishment. London: Anthony Blond Ltd., 1959.
- Thomson, David. England in the Nineteenth Century. Harmondsworth: Penguin Book Ltd., 1969.
- Thornton, Percy Melville. Harrow School and Its Surroundings. London: W.H. Allen and Co., 1885.

- Torre, Rev. Henry John. Recollections of School-days at Harrow more than Fifty Years Ago. Manchester: Charles Simms and Co., 1890.
- Trevelyan, G.M. A Shortened History of England. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963.
- British History in the Nineteenth Century and After; 1782-1919. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1965.
- Vaughan, Charles John. Memorials of Harrow Sundays. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1859.
- Wakeford, John. The Cloistered Elite: A Sociological Analysis of the English Public Boarding School. London: John Wakeford, 1969.
- Warner, G.T. Harrow in Prose and Verse. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.
- Weinberg, Ian. The English Public Schools. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.
- Welch, R de C. and Wilbee, J.C. The Harrow Calendar 3 vols. Harrow: Crossley and Clarke, 1860-1881.
- Whitridge, Arnold. Dr. Arnold of Rugby. London: Constable and Co. Ltd., 1928.
- Wilkinson, R. The Prefects: British Leadership and the Public School Tradition. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Willey, Basil. Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew Arnold. London: Chatto and Windus, 1964.
- Williams, Sir John Fischer. Harrow. London: Bell and Sons, 1901.
- Williamson, Eugene L. The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1964.
- Woodward, Sir Llewellyn. The Age of Reform 1815-1870. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Woodward, F.J. The Doctor's Disciples (Stanley, Gell, Clough, William Arnold). London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Worsley, T.C. Barbarians and Philistines: Democracy and the Public Schools. London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1940.
- Wymer, Norman. Dr. Arnold of Rugby. London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1953.
- Young, G.M. ed. Early Victorian England, 1830-1865. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Victorian England: Portrait of An Age. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Elementary Education Acts, England and Wales. 1888

Report of the Royal Commission of 1858-61. Lord Newcastle, Chairman.

Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education, 1894-5. Bryce Commission.

Report of the Schools Inquiry Commission, 1864-68. Lord Clarendon, Chairman

PERIODICALS

All the Year Round. April 19th 1879.

American Eclectic. January 1842. January 1846.

American Journal of Education. 1857.

American Whig Review. Vol. 10.

Anglican Theological Review. January 1962. Vol. XLIV.

Baily's Magazine of Sports and Pastimes. April 1861. September 1879.

Bentley's Miscellany. Vol. 20. 1846.

Biblical Review. Vols. I & II.

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine. February 1843, February 1861, May 1862, August 1864.

British and Foreign Review (or European Quarterly Journal) October 1835-October 1863.

British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review. October 1841.

British Journal of Sociology. 1954-1961.

British Quarterly Review. 1866-1868.

Christian Examiner. January 1844.

- Christian Observer and Advocate. 1849-1871.
- Christian Remembrancer. Vol. 8.
- Christian Review. March 1845.
- Church History. Vol. XXIX 1960.
- Church Quarterly Review. Vol. XLXII 1961.
- The Congregationalist. Vol. 4.
- Contemporary Review. 1900-1942.
- Dublin Review. Vol. 31. 1878.
- Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature. April 1843, January 1845.
- Edinburgh Review. 1810-1897.
- Education: A Journal for the Scholastic World. December 1890.
- Educational Review. 1810. 1957.
- Encounter. Vol. XXXV July 1970.
- English Illustrated Magazine. Vol. 5. August 1888.
- Etoniana. January 3rd and April 11th 1938.
- Fortnightly Review. December 1902. April 1911.
- Fraser's Magazine. 1842.
- The Harrovian. 1890-1893.
- History Today. Vol. I 1950. Vol. XIII December 1963.
- Hogg's Instructor. Vol. 13.
- Horizon. Vol. XI 1969.
- John Bull. May 3rd 1830 - May 22nd 1836.
- Journals of Education. February 1st 1884. July 1896.
- The Listener. April 27th 1967.
- Living Age. Vols. 3. 41. 55.
- London Quarterly and Holborn Review. Vol. 51.
- London Society. Vols. 5. 12. 16.

Ludgate Monthly. October 1892.

Macmillan's Magazine. 1866.

The Marlburian. October 25th 1866. November 1st 1851.

The Meteor. 1871-1934.

Methodist Quarterly Review. 1846.

National Review. June 1942.

Nature. March 1870.

New Englander and Yale Review. July 1847.

The New Rugbeian. October 1858 - March 1860.

The Nineteenth Century. January 1880.

North American Review. 1846.

North British Review. February 1845. February - May 1858.

Observer. 12th April, 1970.

The Parents' Review. Vols. VI & VII. 1895-1896.

Phylon Quarterly. Vol. 18. 1957.

Physical Education. Vol. 47. 1955.

Princeton Review. Vol. 17. April 1845.

Prospective Review. February 1845.

Public School Magazine. May 1898.

Quarterly Journal of Education. 1832-1884.

Quarterly Review. 1825-1964.

The Rugby Magazine. Vol. I. October 1835. Vol. II. July 1837.

The Rugby Miscellany. No. VII February 1846.

Saint James Magazine. Vols. 36 and 37.

Select Journal. Vol. 3.

Sewance Review. October 1927.

Spectator. 18th June, 1892.

Theological and Literary Journal. Vol. 8.

The Times. January 1833 - December 1874.

Titan: A monthly magazine. Vol. 13.

Weekly Dispatch. December 1916.

Westminster Review. February 1843. September 1844.

UNPUBLISHED THESES

Honey, J.R. de S. The Victorian Public School, 1828-1902: The School as a Community. An Unpublished D. Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford 1969.

Leppert, W.A. Culture against Anarchy; Dr. Thomas Arnold and the Englishman's Register.

Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Northwestern University, 1970.

Shewell, M.E.J. An Historical Investigation of the Development of a Local System of Education in the City of Birmingham from 1870 to 1924.

Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of London. 1952.

M.S.S. COLLECTIONS

Bodley's Library, Oxford.

British Museum. London

Brotherton Library, University of Leeds.

Bury St. Edmunds Town Archives, Bury St. Edmunds.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

Harrow School Vaughan Library, Harrow.

Marlborough College, Marlborough.

Oriel College, Oxford.

Rugby School Temple Reading Room, Rugby.

Statham Collection, Bury St. Edmunds.

APPENDIX "A"

ASSISTANT MASTERS AND PUPILS UNDER ARNOLD WHO WERE APPOINTED
TO POSITIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

The following information is taken from The Rugby Register, 1675-1842, by A.T. Mitchell, Rugby, A.J. Lawrence, 1902.

Arnold, Charles Thomas, eldest son of the Rev. Richard Aldous Arnold, Ellough, Beccles, aged 13, October, 26th. Entered Rugby August 1831. Pons House.

Exhibitioner, 1836. Balliol College, Oxford, 1836. Scholar of Magdalen Hall. B.A. 2nd. Class in Classics, 1840. M.A. 1843. Assistant Master at Rugby, 1841-78. Died in Rome, 9th. May, 1878.

Arnold, Edward Penrose, third son of Dr. Thomas Arnold, Rugby. Aged 12, October, 28th. Entered Rugby, August, 1838. School House.

Balliol College, Oxford. B.A. 1848, M.A. 1851. Fellow of All Souls, 1852. One of H.M. Inspectors of School. Died at Fox Howe, Ambleside, 6th April, 1878.

Arnold, Matthew, eldest son of Dr. Thomas Arnold, of Rugby. Aged 14, June, 26th. Entered Rugby, August, 1837. School House.

Exhibitioner 1841. Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. Newdigate Prize, 1843. B.A. 1844. M.A. & Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, 1853. Professor of Poetry, 1857. Hon. D.C.L. 1870. One of H.M. Inspectors of School. Author of "Sohrab and Rustum" and other poems and essays. Died 15th April, 1888. A bust to his memory was unveiled in Westminster Abbey, 21st., October, 1891.

Anstey, Charles Alleyne, son of John Anstey, Esq., Hertford St., London, Aged 13 in May. Entered Rugby Midsummer, 1810. School House.

Exhibitioner 1815. Trinity College, Oxford, 1815. B.A. 1820. M.A. 1825. Assistant Master at Rugby School 1819-1854. Fellow on the Foundation. Vicar of Coggs, Oxon. 1870-1872. Died 19th August, 1881.

Bell, William, eldest son of the late Dr. Thomas Bell, and Mrs. Bell, Cheltenham. Aged 14, March 12th. Entered Rugby August, 1841. Mayor House.

Brasenose College, Oxford. B.A. 1849. M.A. 1854. Headmaster of the Cathedral School, Carlisle. Afterwards curate of Wimbledon.

Blanford, Josias Jessop, son of the Rev. Joseph Blandford, Kirton, Notts. Aged 13, November 6th. Entered August, 1829. School House.

Christ's College, Cambridge. B.A. 1839. M.A. 1878. One of H.M. Inspectors of Schools. In Holy Orders. Of Felixholme, Sylvan Road, Upper Norwood.

Bradby, Edward Henry, only son of the late Edward Taylor Bradby, and Mrs. Bradby, Southern Hill, Reading. Aged 12 December, 15th. Entered Rugby, August, 1839. Anstey House.

Exhibitioner 1845. Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. B.A. First Class Classics, 1848. M.A. 1852. Assistant Master at Harrow, 1853-68. Headmaster of Haileybury, 1868-83. Hon. Canon of St. Alban's, 1878. Hon. D.D. Durham, 1882. Died 2nd December, 1893.

Bradley, George Granville, fourth son of the Rev. Charles Bradley, Clapham, Surrey, Aged 15, December, 11th. Entered Rugby, August, 1837. Price House.

Exhibitioner 1840. Scholar of University College, Oxford. B.A. First Class in Classics, 1844. Latin Essay, 1845. Fellow & M.A. 1847. Assistant Master at Rugby, 1846-58. Headmaster of Marlborough, 1858-70. Master of University College, Oxford, 1870. Member of the Governing Body of Rugby School, 1871. D.D. 1881. Dean of Westminster, 1881. Author of "Life of Dean Stanley."

Brereton, Joseph Lloyd, third son of the Rev. Charles David Brereton, Little Massingham, Norfolk. Aged 16, October 19th. Entered Rugby, February, 1839. School House.

Scholar of University College, Oxford. B.A., 1848. M.A., 1857. Newdigate Prize, 1844. Prebendary of Exeter, 1858. Founder of the Devon and Norfolk County Schools and of Cavendish College, Cambridge. Rector of Little Massingham, Swaffham, 1867. Died 15th. August, 1901.

Bryan, Reginald Guy, son of the Rev. Guy Bryan, Woodham Walter, Essex. Aged 13 March 16th., Entered August, 1832. Buckoll House.

Exhibitioner 1837. Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A. 23rd. Wrangler, 1842. M.A., 1848. Principal of the College at Malta. Vicar of Fosbury, Hungerford, 1856-75. Principal of Monkton Combe College, Bath, 1875-97. Of Combe Down, Bath.

Byrne, John Rice, third son of Henry George Byrne and Mrs. Byrne, Worcester, Aged 14, August 6th. Entered Rugby, August, 1841. Cotton House.

University College, Oxford. B.A., 1850. M.A., 1854. In Holy Orders. One of H.M. Inspectors of Schools, 1861-92. Of Grange House, Upper Norwood, London, S.E.

Buckland, John Richard, eldest son of the Rev. John Buckland, Laleham, Middlesex. Aged 12, August 3rd. Entered Rugby, August, 1831. School House.

Christ Church Oxford. B.A., 1840. Master of Hutchins' School, Van Dieman's Land. Died at Hobart Town, Tasmania, 12th October, 1874.

Buckoll, Henry James, eldest son of the Rev. James Buckoll, Siddington, Cirencester. Aged 14, September, 9th. Entered Rugby, January, 1818. School House.

Exhibitioner, 1822. Queen's College, Oxford. B.A., 1826. M.A., 1829. In Holy Orders. Assistant Master at Rugby, 1826-71. At Rugby under six Headmasters. Died 6th., June, 1871.

Bull, William John, son of the Rev. W.H. Bull, Sowerby, Halifax. Aged 14, December, 14th. Entered February, 1839. Anstey House.

Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A. Senior Optime and 2nd Class Classical Tripos, 1847. M.A., 1850. Assistant Master at Harrow, 1853-88. Died 14th., January, 1890.

Burbidge, Thomas, son of Thomas Burbidge, Esq., Leicester. Aged 14, March 10th. Entered Rugby, January, 1830. Townsend House.

Aberdeen University. LL.D. Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A., 1842. Master of Leamington College, 1851-7. Successively Chaplain at Trieste, Malta and Palermo. Canon of Gibraltar, 1868. Died, 29th., September, 1892.

Churton, Thomas Townson, son of the Ven. Ralph Churton, Archdeacon of St. David's. Aged 13, December 4th., Entered Rugby after Midsummer, 1812. School House.

Exhibitioner, 1817. Brasenose College, Oxford. B.A. First Class in Classics, 1820. Fellow, 1821-52. M.A., 1823. Proctor, 1830. Assistant Master at Rugby School, 1825. Rector of West Shefford, Berks., 1851. Died at Oxford, 9th., December, 1865.

Collis, John Day, eldest son of the Rev. Robert Collis, Kilcullen, Kildare, Ireland. Aged 16, February, 24th. Entered Rugby, August, 1832. Grenfell House.

Merton College, Oxford. Postmaster 1832-4. Scholar of Worcester College, 1835. B.A. First Class, 1838. Fellow, 1839-47. M.A., 1841. D.D., 1860. Master of Bromsgrove School, 1843-67. Vicar of Stratford-on-Avon, 1867. Hon. Canon of Worcester, 1863. Founder and Warden of Stratford-on-Avon School, 1872. Died April 1st., 1879.

Congreve, Richard, third son of Thomas Congreve, Esq., Combe, Warwickshire, Aged 13, September 4th., Entered Rugby, August, 1832. Bird House.

Exhibitioner, 1837. Wadham College, Oxford. B.A., First Class, 1840. M.A., 1843. Fellow, 1844-54. Assistant Master at Rugby, 1845. M.R.C.P. Editor of Aristotle's "Politics" and of several Essays and Publications, of which "Human Catholicism" is the best known. Died 7th., July, 1899.

Cotterill, George, son of the Rev. Joseph Cotterill, Blakeney, Cley, Norfolk. Aged 16, July 13th. Entered Rugby, Easter, 1831. Moor House.

St. John's College, Cambridge. B.A., 1837. Master in Christ's College, Christchurch, New Zealand, 1857-68. Canon of the Cathedral there from 1866 until his death, September, 1902.

Right Rev. George Edward Lynch Cotton, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, B.A. & 8th., in First Class Classics, 1836. M.A., 1839. D.D., 1858. Headmaster of Marlborough College, 1852. Consecrated Bishop of Calcutta, 1858. Died October, 1866. Assistant Master at Rugby School, 1836-52.

Crawford, John Robert, eldest son of Capt., John Crawford, Rugby, Aged 13, November, 29th. Entered Rugby, January, 1830. Town.

Lincoln College, Oxford. Scholar, 1835. B.A. Second Class, 1838. M.A., 1840. Headmaster Berkhamstead Grammar School, Died, 1863.

Dale, Henry, second son of John Dale, Esq., Coleshill, Warwickshire. Aged 14, April, 10th. Entered Rugby, January, 1827. Moor House.

Exhibitioner, 1830. Worcester College, Oxford, 1830. Demy, Magdalen College, B.A., 1834. M.A., 1836. First Class in Classics. Author of a translation of Thucydides. Headmaster of the Proprietary School, Blackheath, 1851. Rector of Wilby, Northants., 1853. Died ca. 1895.

Durham, Thomas Charles, son of Mrs. Durham, Rugby. Aged 14, September, 29th. Entered Rugby, February, 1840. Town.

Jesus College, Cambridge. B.A., Wrangler, 1849. Fellow, M.A., 1852. Headmaster of the Berwick Grammar School, 1856-61, and of the Cathedral School, Carlisle, 1861-76. Hon. Canon of Carlisle, 1868. Of Oak Park House, Dawlish, South Devon.

Fraser, Simon James Gordon, eldest son of Simon Fraser, Esq., Bengal. Aged 14, June 13th. Entered Rugby, February, 1839. Powlett House.

Exeter College, Oxford, 1843. New Inn Hall, B.A., 1848. M.A., 1854. In Holy Orders. One of H.M. Inspectors of Schools. Brambly's Basingstoke.

Gantillon, Peter John Francis, son of the late Peter Gantillon, Esq. and ward of the Rev. E. Mortlock, Christ's College, Cambridge, Aged 11, April 9th. Entered Rugby, August, 1840. Cotton House.

St. John's College, Cambridge. Scholar, 1847. B.A., First in Second Class Classical Tripos, 1851. M.A., 1854. In Holy Orders. Assistant Master at Cheltenham College, 1861-85. Of 5, Fauconberg Terrace, Cheltenham.

Gover, William, son of W. Gover, Esq., Winchester, Aged 17, January, 13th. Entered Rugby, Easter, 1835. Bird House.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. B.A., 1842. M.A., 1845. Principal Saltley Training College, 1852-71. Honorary Canon of Worcester, 1867. Died, 16th, November, 1896.

Greenwood, Henry, eldest son of the late Rev. William Greenwood and Mrs. Greenwood, Rugby, Aged 10, June 1st. Entered Rugby, August, 1840. Town.

Queen's College, Oxford, 1848. Exhibitioner. Lincoln College, 1849-51. Demy, Magdalen College, 1851-66. B.A., 1852. M.A., 1855. Assistant Master at Shrewsbury School, 1854. Rector of Beelsby, Lincolnshire, 1865. Died October, 20th, 1895.

Highton, Henry, eldest son of Henry Highton, Esq., Leicester. Aged 13, January 19th. Entered Rugby, January, 1829. Townsend House.

Exhibitioner, 1834. Queen's College, Oxford. Scholar, B.A. First Class in Classics, 1837. M.A., 1840. Fellow, 1840-1. Assistant Master at Rugby, 1841-59. Principal of Cheltenham College 1859-62. Medal of the Society of Arts for his discoveries with reference to electric telegraphs. Died December, 1874.

Rev. Herbert Hill, Fellow of New College, Oxford. B.A., 1832. M.A., 1836. Assistant Master at Rugby, 1836-39. Master of Warwick School 1842-76. Master of Lord Leycester's Hospital, Warwick, 1884. Died ca. 1892.

Hoare, Charles Hugh, third son of George Mathew Hoare, Esq., Marden, Surrey. Aged 14, October, 24th. Entered Rugby, Easter, 1834.

Exeter College, Oxford. B.A., 1841. Sole partner in Hoare's Brewery, Smithfield. A great patron of cricket and athletic sports. Died 4th., April, 1869.

Hutchins, Frederick Leigh, son of W. Hutchins, Esq., 25, Hanover Square, London. Aged 12, September, 23rd. Entered Rugby, February, 1840. School House.

A solicitor, 11, Birchin Lane, London. Address, 22, Queen's Gardens, London, W. In 1845, he, with W. Arnold and W.W. Shirley, drew up the Rugby "Rules of Football". He assisted in the annotation of the School Register, 1881. Died 6th., April, 1899.

Koe, Robert Louis, son of J. Herbert Koe, Esq., Lincoln's Inn, London. Aged 16, March 21st. Entered Bef. 1835. Townsend House.

Christ's College, Cambridge. B.A., 1843. M.A., 1846. In Holy Orders. One of H.M. Inspectors of Schools, 1866-93. 9, Powis Villas, Brighton.

Lake, William Charles, eldest son of Capt., Charles Lake, Rugby. Aged 8 in January. Entered after Midsummer, 1825. Town.

Head of the School, 1834. Exhibitioner, 1835. Balliol College, Oxford. Scholar, 1834. B.A., First Class in Classics, 1838. Fellow, 1839. M.A., 1841. Latin Essay, 1840. D.D., 1869. Member of the Royal Commission on Education. Dean of Durham, 1869. Died at Torquay, 8th. December, 1897.

Right Rev. James Prince Lee, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Craven Scholar, 1827. B.A., 1828. M.A., 1831. D.D., 1861. Master of Birmingham School, 1838. Consecrated First Bishop of Manchester, 1848. Died December, 1869. Assistant at Rugby School 1830-1838.

Mayor, Charles, son of the Rev. J. Mayor, Collingham, Notts. Aged 14, July 20th. Entered Rugby, Easter, 1829. Anstey House.

Exhibitioner, 1833. Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A., Fourth in First Class in Classics, 1837. M.A., 1840. Assistant Master at Rugby School, 1840-6. Died 31st. August, 1846. A Memorial Inscription, written by the Rev. Charles Arnold, was placed in the School Chapel.

Messiter, George Malin, eldest son of George Messiter, Esq., Frome, Somerset. Aged 13, October, 12th. Entered Rugby August, 1831. Price House. Captain of Rugby.

Exhibitioner, 1836. Scholar of Wadham College, Oxford, 1835-46. B.A., 1841. M.A., 1843. Master at Repton School, 1852. Died 19th May, 1874.

Moor, James Hoare, eldest son of the Rev. James Hoare Christopher Moor, Rugby. Aged 6, May 19th. Entered Rugby January, 1823. Town.

Exhibitioner, 1834, Magdalen College, Oxford. Demy, 1834-43. Master of Kingsbridge School. Died at Uttoxeter, 30th October, 1856. The father was Assistant Master at Rugby School from 1800 to 1831.

Newman, William Turner, son of Mrs. Turner, Rugby. Aged 8, October 20th. Entered Rugby, August, 1828.

Trinity College, Cambridge. Scholar, 1838. B.A., 1843. M.A., 1846. Assistant Master at Cheltenham.

Newmarch, Charles Henry, son of G. Newmarch, Esq., Cirencester, Aged 13, March, 30th. Entered Rugby, August, 1837. Stanley House.

Sometime in the Merchant Service. Author of "Recollections of Rugby", by an Old Rugbaean, 1848.

Parry, Edward St. John, eldest son of the Ven. Thomas Parry, afterwards Bishop of Antigua, Aged 14, June 25th. Entered Rugby, 1840. Price House.

Balliol College, Oxford. B.A. First Class in Classics, 1848. English Essay, 1849. Latin Essay, 1850. M.A., 1851. Sometime Warden of Queen's College, Birmingham. Professor of Classics, Trinity College, Toronto. Principal of Leamington College, 1857-66. Master of a Preparatory School at Stoke Poges. Died 12th. September, 1896.

Penrose, Charles Thomas, son of Rev. John Penrose, Bracebridge, Lincoln. Aged 12, July 15th. Entered Rugby, 1828, in August. School House.

Exhibitioner, 1835. Trinity College, Cambridge. Bell Scholar, 1836. B.A. Second Class in Classics, 1839. M.A., 1842. Headmaster of Sherbourne School, 1845-50. Editor of Select Orations of Demosthenes. Died ca. 1870.

Rev. John Penrose, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, B.A., 1836. M.A. 1839. Master of a school at Exmouth, 1846-72. Educated at Winchester College. Assistant Master at Rugby, 1839-1846. Died in Norway, 20th. June, 1888.

Rev. Percy William Powlett, M.A., son of the Rev. Charles Powlett, Vicar of Itchen Stoke, Hants. Aged 7, August, 22nd. Entered Rugby after Midsummer, 1810. School House.

Exhibitioner, 1820. Trinity College, Oxford. B.A., 1824. Fellow of Queen's, 1828-34. Assistant Master at Rugby School, 1825-40. Rector of Frankton, 1838. Died 22nd September, 1866.

Bonamy Price, M.A., Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. First Class in Classics and Mathematics, 1829. At Rugby from 1830 to 1850, when he resigned. Professor of Political Economy, Oxford, 1873. Died 8th January, 1888.

Price, Edward Henry, son of M. Price, Esq., Great Coram Street, London. Aged 13, May, 28th. Entered Rugby, Easter, 1836. Price House.

St. John's College, Cambridge. B.A., 1845. M.A., 1863. Master of the Philberd's School, Maidenhead. Rector of Willey, Lutterworth, 1888. Died 22nd., September, 1898.

Sale, Charles James, son of John Shaw Sale, Esq., Rugby, Aged 10, March 31st. Entered Rugby, August, 1838. Town.

Head Teacher of the State School, Kanieri, New Zealand. Died, 1897.

Sandford, Henry Ryder Poole, eldest son of the Rev. John Sandford, Dunchurch. Aged 13, October 1st. Entered Rugby, August, 1840. Arnold House.

Balliol College, Oxford, 1845. Scholar, Magdalen Hall, and B.A., 1849. M.A., 1854. One of H.M. Inspectors of Schools, 1862. Died February, 3rd., 1883.

Simpkinson, John Nassau, son of John Augustus Francis Simpson, Esq., Q.C., Lincoln's Inn. Aged 14, January 1st. Entered Rugby, February, 1831. School House.

Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A., 10th., in First Class in Classical Tripos, 1839. M.A., 1842. Assistant Master at Harrow. Rector of Brighton, Northants, 1855-68. Rector of North Creak, Norfolk, 1868. Author of "Memoir of Rev. George Wagner," and other works. Died 17th., April, 1894.

Turner, Dawson William, second son of Dawson Turner, Esq.; Gt. Yarmouth. Aged 16, December 25th. Entered Rugby, August, 1832. Pons House.

Exeter College, Oxford, 1834. Demy, Magdalen College, 1836-46. B.A., 1838. M.A., 1840. D.C.L., 1862. Headmaster of Royal Institution School, Liverpool. Died 29th January, 1885.

Vaughan, Charles John, son of the Rev. Edward Thomas Vaughan, an Old Rugbeian and Mrs. Vaughan, Leicester. Aged 13, August 6th. Entered Rugby, January, 1830. Townsend House.

Exhibitioner, 1834. Trinity College, Cambridge, 1834. First class in College Examinations, 1835. Craven Scholar and Porson's Prizeman, 1836. Obtained the prizes for the Latin Essay, the Greek Ode, the Greek and Latin Epigrams, and was bracketed first in First Class Classical Tripos, 1837. B.A., 1838. Fellow, 1839. M.A., 1841. D.D., 1845. Headmaster of Harrow, 1844-59. Vicar of Doncaster, 1851. Master of the Temple, 1869. Dean of Llandaff, 1879. Died, 15th October, 1897.

Vaughan, David James, son of Rev. Edward Thomas Vaughan and Mrs. Vaughan, Leicester. Aged 15, August 2nd. Entered Rugby, August, 1840. Cotton House.

Exhibitioner, 1844. Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. Bell Scholar, 1845. B.A., 5th. in First Class Classical Tripos, 1848. Browne's Medallist for Latin Ode, and for Greek and Latin Epigrams. Member's Prizeman, and Bachelor's Prize, 1848. M.A., Fellow, 1851. Vicar of St. Martin's Leicester, 1860-93. Hon. Canon of Peterborough, 1872. Master from 1860 of Wyggeston's Hospital, Leicester.

Vaughan, Edwyn Henry, son of the late Rev. Edward Thomas Vaughan and Mrs. Vaughan, Leicester. Aged 14, October, 9th. Entered Rugby Easter, 1833.

Christ's College, Cambridge, Member's Prizeman. B.A., Senior Optime and Second Class Classical Tripos, 1842. M.A., 1845. In Holy Orders. Assistant Master at Harrow, 1849-66. Died at Bath, 31st. January, 1868.

Walford, Henry, third son of the Rev. William Walford, Hatfield, Witham, Essex. Aged 13, May 15th. Entered Rugby, February, 1838. Price House.

Exhibitioner, 1841. Wadham College, Oxford. B.A., 1846. M.A., 1848. Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall, 1852-4. Head Master of St. Nicolas' College, Lancing, 1857-9. Assistant Master at Haileybury, 1863-83. Died 23rd. December, 1893.

Warburton, William Parsons, Fourth son of Major Warburton Warburton, Bresford Lodge, Chester. Aged 15, January 17th. Entered Rugby, February, 1841. Cotton House.

Balliol College, Oxford. B.A., First Class in Classics, 1849. Fellow of All Souls, 1849-53. M.A., 1853. One of H.M. Inspectors of Schools, 1851-81. Inspector of Training Colleges, 1881-5. Canon of Winchester, 1885. The Close, Winchester.

Woodrow, Henry, son of the late Henry Woodrow, Esq., Norwich, Aged 15, July, 31st. Entered Rugby February, 1839.

Caius College, Cambridge, 1842. B.A., 14th Wrangler, 1846. M.A., 1849. Junior Fellow, 1846-54. Principal of the College of La Martiniere, Calcutta, 1848. Held other educational appointments in India, 1854-76. Died at Darjeeling, 11th October, 1876. A marble bust was erected to his memory by the natives of Bengal, and there is also a bust of him in Caius College Library.

Wratislaw, Albert Henry, son of William Ferdinand Wratislaw, Esq., Rugby. Aged 7, November 5th. Entered Rugby, August, 1829. Town.

Christ's College, Cambridge, 1842. B.A., First Class, 1844. Headmaster of Felsted and afterwards of Bury St. Edmunds Schools. Author. In Holy Orders. At Felsted from 1852-5 and Bury St. Edmunds, 1855-79. Died 3rd. November, 1892.

Wright, Josiah, son of J. Wright, Esq., Cheshunt, Herts. Aged 15, February 5th. Entered Rugby, February, 1839. Anstey House.

Exhibitioner, 1842. Trinity College, Cambridge. Scholar, 1842. B.A., Senior Optime, 1846. M.A., 1849. In Holy Orders. Master of Sutton Coldfield Grammar School. Author. Died 30th May, 1894.

APPENDIX "B"

RUGBY CHAPEL

O strong soul, by what shore
Tarriest thou now? For that force,
Surely, has not been left vain!
Somewhere, surely, afar,
In the sounding labour-house vast
Of being, is practised that strength,
Zealous, beneficent, firm!
Yes, in some far-shining sphere,
Conscious or not of the past,
Still thou performest the word
Of the Spirit in whom thou dost live--
Prompt, unwearied, as here!
Still thou upraisest with zeal
The humble from the ground.
Sternly represses the bad!
Still, like a trumpet, dost rouse
Those who with half-open eyes
Tread the border-land dim
'Twixt vice and virtue; reviv'st,
Succourest!--this was thy work,
This was thy life upon earth.

If, in the paths of the world,
Stones might have wounded thy feet,
Toil or dejection have tried
Thy spirit, of that we saw
Nothing--to us thou wast still
Cheerful, and helpful, and firm!
Therefore to thee it was given
Many to save with thyself;
And, at the end of thy day,
O faithful shepherd! to come,
Bringing thy sheep in thy hand.

And through thee I believe
In the noble and great who are gone;
Pure souls honour'd and blest
By former ages, who else--
Such so soulless, so poor,
Is the race of men whom I see--
Seem'd but a dream of the heart,
Seem'd but a cry of desire.

Yes! I believe that there lived
 Others like thee in the past,
 Not like the men in the crowd
 Who all round me to-day
 Bluster or cringe, and make life
 Hideous, and arid, and vile;
 But souls temper'd with fire,
 Fervent, heroic, and good,
 Helpers and friends of mankind.

Servants of God! or sons,
 Shall I not call you? because
 Not as servants ye knew
 Your Father's innermost mind,
 His who unwillingly sees
 One of his little ones lost--
 Yours is the praise, if mankind
 Hath not as yet in its march
 Fainted, and fallen, and died!

See! In the rocks of the world
 Marches the host of mankind,
 A feeble, wavering line.
 Where are they tending? A God
 Marshall'd them, gave them their goal.
 Ah! but the way is so long!
 Years they have been in the wild!
 Sore thirst plagues them, the rocks,
 Rising all round, overawe;
 Factions divide them, their host
 Threatens to break, to dissolve.
 --Ah, keep, keep them combined!
 Else, of the myriads who fill
 That army, not one shall arrive;
 Sole they shall stray: in the rocks
 Stagger for ever in vain,
 Die one by one in the waste.
 Then, in such hour of need
 Of your fainting, dispirited race,
 Ye, like angels, appear,
 Radiant with ardour divine!
 Beacons of hope, ye appear!
 Langour is not in your heart,
 Weakness is not in your word,
 Weariness not on your brow.
 Ye alight in our van! at your voice
 Panic, despair flee away.
 Ye move through the ranks, recall
 The stragglers, refresh the outworn,
 Praise, re-inspire the brave!
 Order, courage, return.
 Eyes rekindling, and prayers,
 Follow your steps as you go.

Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line,
Stablish, continue our march,
On, to the bound of the waste,
On to the City of God.

Matthew Arnold.

As reprinted in Fitch, op. cit. pp 271-4

APPENDIX "C"

A BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF THE HISTORY OF RUGBY SCHOOL*
FROM ITS FOUNDING TO THE END OF ARNOLD'S TENURE

- 1567 Lawrence Sheriff executed his will, added a codicil and died. His will made provision for a School House at Rugby and a Free Grammar School.
- Ca. 1600-2 Richard Seele, first master of the School appointed. Eleven Trustees appointed under Decree in Chancery.
- 1602-5 Nicholas Greenhill, second master of the school, appointed.
- 1605 Augustine Rolfe, third master appointed.
William Greene, fourth master appointed.
- 1642 Ralph Pearce, fifth master appointed.
- 1651 Ralph Pearce died and Peter Whitehead, the sixth master appointed.
- 1653 Decree in Chancery on the litigation of John Howkins was given in favour of the school, but was appealed.
John Allen, seventh master appointed.
- 1667 Final judgement in favour of the school given on the litigation of John Howkins.
- 1669 Knightly Harrison, eighth master appointed.
- 1675 Robert Ashbridge, ninth master appointed. Commenced the Rugby School Register.
- 1681 Leonard Jeacock, tenth master appointed.
- 1686 Permission for the partition of the Lamb's Conduit fields and a building lease granted for the school's Middlesex property.
- 1687 Henry Holyoake, eleventh master elected on the death of Jeacock. The first outstanding master to be appointed. Remained as Headmaster for forty-four years and died while still holding the position. He left his library to the school and these books were kept for many years, but have now all disappeared. The numbers of boys at the school averaged ca. thirty during Holyoake's tenure.
- 1731 John Plomer, twelfth master appointed.

* Most of the information given here is taken from Mathew Holbeche Bloxam, O.R., F.S.A., Rugby, the School and Neighbourhood, (Ed. Rev. W.H. Payne Smith, M.A.) London: Whittaker & Co., 1889, pp 1-5.

- 1742 The thirteenth master, Thomas Crossfield, came to Rugby with a very high reputation. Also brought fifty students who had to be boarded in the town, leading to the establishment of boarding houses. All hopes of a brilliant career were dashed when he died only two years after accepting the appointment.
- 1744 Appointment of William Knail, D.D.
- 1748 The first Act of Parliament relating to Rugby School was passed.
- 1749 The Manor House and eight acres of land were purchased at Rugby for the master's house and as a site for a new school room.
- 1750 The school removed to its new site. The Charity's finances in a perilous state.
- 1751 The fifteenth master of the school, Joseph Richmond appointed. During his tenure the Rugby School Register was not kept up.
- 1755 Stanley Burrough, the sixteenth master appointed. He continued in the post for twenty-three years, during which time the numbers in the school averaged eighty.
- 1774 The open fields of Rugby enclosed. The school awarded eight acres of land in lieu of two cottage commons or rights or pasturage belonging to the school.
- 1777 An Act of Parliament passed by which provision was made for the salaries of Assistant Masters: exhibitions founded, and rules and regulations affecting the governance of the school set forth. From this date the staff of the school consisted of a Head Master and Assistant Masters. Sometimes said to have been the year of the "dawn of splendors" for the school.
- 1778 The first Headmaster, and seventeenth master, Dr. Thomas James, appointed. From this time Rugby might be said to be a Public School. During Jame's tenure the numbers rose from ca. eighty to ca. two-hundred and forty; Nearby barns were fitted up as schoolrooms.
- 1779 A new schoolroom, adjoining that built in 1750, was erected. A small plunging-bath (swimming-pool) built.
- 1783 Samuel Butler, later Headmaster of Shrewsbury and Bishop of Lichfield, entered Rugby school as a pupil. He was also to apply for the headmastership, unsuccessfully, of Rugby in 1807.
- 1794 Henry Ingles, D.D., the eighteenth master, and second Headmaster of the school appointed.

- 1807 Dr. John Wooll, the third Headmaster, and nineteenth master, appointed.
- 1808 Plans prepared for re-building the Headmaster's house with dining hall, studies and dormitory. Estimated cost - £9,400.
- 1809 Following an order in Chancery, plans and estimates were prepared for re-building the school house, and all the school buildings so as to provide a composite whole. The estimated cost - £32,000.
- 1813 The new buildings completed - cost £38,000
- 1814 An Act of Parliament provided for the building of a Chapel and the appointment and payment of a Chaplain.
- 1818 The foundation stone of the new chapel laid by the Headmaster, John Wooll, D.D.
- 1821 The leases of the Middlesex property fell in.
- 1826 Retiring Fellowships, of not more than £200 p.a. were approved by Act of Parliament, subject to the discretion of the Trustees, for bestowal on Assistant Masters after a certain period of service. These Fellowships continued until the Public Schools Act of 1868.
- 1827 Dr. Wooll tendered his resignation. Actually retired the following year.
- 1828 Dr. Thomas Arnold, twentieth master, fourth Headmaster, appointed.
- 1829 A.P. Stanley, the future author of Dr. Arnold's Life and Dean of Westminster, entered the school as a pupil.
- 1838 The London to Birmingham railway line opened. As it passed through Rugby it led to a considerable increase in the number of boys at the school.
- During Arnold's tenure the schoolroom over the gate was built, and used as the Sixth Form School and the library. The books in the library were considerably increased, with those bequeathed the school by Henry Holyoake kept separate. Painted glass was purchased and placed in the windows of the Chapel. Part of the area under the Chapel was excavated to be used as a burial place for masters or boys who died at school. Arnold was buried there, following his death in 1842.
- 1842 Dr. Arnold died and A.C. Tait appointed. Shortly after his appointment a fund was raised by subscription for a commemoration of Dr. Arnold. Two projects were undertaken, the Arnold library and an effigy of Arnold. Insufficient funds were provided for both to be executed in a suitable manner and the effigy was, therefore, carved in stone, rather than marble.

APPENDIX "D"

The Lodge,

Marlborough College.

June, 1853

My dear Sir,

In the course of my first year's experience as Master of this College, I have naturally thought over plans by which the general welfare and discipline of the boys might be promoted, and I wish at the end of it, to lay before you my views on one or two subjects.

I. The first of these, is the important one of the boys' amusements. In most public Schools of long standing these are regulated very much by prescription, and the subscriptions, necessary for keeping them up, are levied as a matter of course on every member of the School. Here there has not been time for such a tradition to grow up; and the result is, that both subscriptions and games are very imperfectly organized. To the Cricket Club (which also provides for the expenses of foot-ball and hockey) not half the School subscribe, and the result of this is bad in many ways. The mass of the School are not trained up to cricket and foot-ball at all, which, as healthy and manly games, are certainly deserving of general encouragement. Instead of this, the money, which should be devoted to the legitimate games of the School, is spent on other amusements, often of a questionable character in themselves, or at least liable to considerable abuse, and which have no effect in providing constant and wholesome recreation for the boys. Many do not spend their half-holidays in the play-ground, but in wandering about the country - some in bird's nesting, or in damaging the property of the neighbours, or other undesirable occupations.

The system of fines has of late been discontinued. It seems clear that there were serious objections to it, of which one may be mentioned here, that the fine for trespass (sic) or disobedience ultimately came out of the parent's pocket, since if a boy's money was stopped as a punishment, the parent was obliged to give him an additional supply, unless he wished to hear of his running into debt. Detentions and impositions have been substituted for fines (except as far as payment for actual breakage or other mischief is concerned) but this change, though it must have diminished parents' expenses, has deprived the College of a considerable sum applicable to public objects. A large part of the expense of levelling the cricket ground was paid for from the fine fund.

Although no compulsory extras are permitted by the charter of the College, and though it is most desirable to keep subscriptions low, yet it is obvious that in every large School, there must be some contributions for public objects and amusements. In the hope of encouraging such as will most obviously conduce to the good of the boys, of introducing gradually the feeling that they should keep as much as possible together as one body in the College itself and in the play-ground; of checking abuses of the liberty which it is necessary to allow, if Marlborough is to confer the advantages, and be conducted on the principles of English Public Schools, under which any system of entire and compulsory restriction to the College premises is quite impossible; I venture to recommend the following objects for your son's subscriptions, and in doing so I am not advising any increase of the money now given to him for such purposes, but only pointing out how, in my judgment, it can be best bestowed for his own advantage, and the general good of the School.

1. THE CRICKET CLUB:- The present Captain of the Eleven has made a calculation, by which it appears that the expenses of cricket and foot-ball might be liberally provided for, if the great majority of the School were to subscribe half-yearly, on the following scale:-

Lower School.....	1s.
Middle School.....	2s.
Fourth Form.....	3s.
Fifth Form.....	4s.
Sixth Form.....	5s.

with some private contributions from the first eleven. This would include the expense of bowler, tent, matches, &c.; would enable every subscriber to play, and might possibly be diminished if all the School were to subscribe.

2. HOUSE LIBRARIES:-It is proposed to establish in each of the three houses, a library of entertaining and improving books, which the boys may take with them to read where they choose, to be selected by a committee of the boys who subscribe, subject to the approbation of the House-Masters, who will undertake the general superintendence and regulation of the libraries. The subscription proposed is 2s. a half-year. It is hoped that, besides the other obvious advantages of such an institution in each house, it might provide some occupation for long afternoons in winter and rainy weather, which are now liable to be misused.

3. THE FIVES-COURTS:- The games of fives and rackets, healthy and good in themselves, and particularly useful at School, as filling up many half-hours when there is not time to get up a game at football or cricket, are suspended at Marlborough from the defective paving of the Courts. A general effort to pave them would be of great advantage to the School, and some external help from its friends has already been promised. This is an object to which the old fine fund would have been properly applicable.

There are other amusements which I hope gradually to see arise, such as carpentering, turning, and some scientific occupations, which have been introduced with success at Woolwich and elsewhere. But it is undesirable to attempt too many things at once. Again, other public objects, such as the Musical Society, though very good in themselves, need not be noticed here, as limited for the most part to those who have some particular taste or talent. Nor do I mention the religious Societies now grouped together under our College Church Union, among the institutions to which I venture to call your attention, partly because my chief motives for sending this circular are unconnected with those societies, but still more, because our desire is that the contributions to the Church Union should spring from a conviction on the part of the boys, that they ought to devote a part of their own money to higher and better objects than their own pleasures, and therefore that any sums given to it should not be supplied from extra funds allowed by their parents, but fairly saved from their own ordinary expenses, as a sign that they desire, according to their ability, to promote the glory of God.

II. There is one subject more which I wish to mention, connected with the Education of the School. So many boys are now not intended for an academical career, that the feeling is becoming general, that it would be well if in our large Schools classes were instituted by the side of the present course of preparation for the Universities, in which modern languages and science should form the principal subjects, and where boys should be prepared for military, naval, engineering, or other pursuits. I do not feel, with my present information, competent to submit to the Council a scheme for introducing such a department here, but it is my desire to do so in the course of the next year; and it would much facilitate my plans if I could form any notion as to the number of pupils likely to be placed under such a course.

Possibly too, we might be able to introduce it gradually, and by way of experiment, before endeavouring to incorporate it in our general School system. It would of course be included in the ordinary charge for education, or at most with the additional expense of a private tutor, which might be necessary till it sufficiently commended itself to public favour, to stand on its own foundation, and to occupy the whole time of one or more Masters.

I must apologize for the length of this communication, which has been occasioned by a deep conviction that no School, least of all one of such recent foundation as ours, can really flourish unless all connected with it, the boys, and their parents, no less than the masters and other authorities, are united in the common desire and effort to raise its general tone, and to make it, in all respects, worthy of the high purposes for which it was instituted.

Believe me,

Yours very faithfully,

G.E.L. Cotton.

B30007